

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11526) to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 24, 1929, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 23 (legislative day of January 17), 1929

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Ensign (Temporary) Gordon P. McGowan to be a lieutenant (junior grade) (temporary) in the Coast Guard of the United States, to take effect from date of oath.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Halsted L. Ritter, of Florida, to be United States district judge, southern district of Florida, vice Rhydon M. Call, deceased.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Howard D. Stabler, of Alaska, to be United States attorney, district of Alaska, division No. 1, vice Justin W. Harding, appointed judge.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 23 (legislative day of January 17), 1929

UNDERSECRETARY OF STATE

State Department

J. Reuben Clark, jr.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

William S. Culbertson to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Chile.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY

H. F. Arthur Schoenfeld to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Bulgaria.

Jefferson Caffery to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Colombia.

Charles S. Wilson to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Rumania.

Warren D. Robbins to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Salvador.

To be consul generals

Thomas H. Bevan.
Felix Cole.
John K. Davis.

George K. Donald.
Paul Knabenshue.
North Winship.

To be vice consuls of career

Norris B. Chipman.
Gaston A. Cournoyer.
Cecil Wayne Gray.
Raymond A. Hare.
Robert O'D. Hinckley.
Frederick P. Latimer, jr.
Edward S. Maney.
Ralph Miller.
Sheldon T. Mills.
James B. Pilcher.

Horace H. Smith.
L. Rutherford Stuyvesant.
Mannix Walker.
Warren H. Kelchner.
R. Borden Reams.
Warren M. Chase.
Llewellyn E. Thompson, jr.
Robert English.
H. Merrell Benninghoff.

To be secretaries, Diplomatic Service

LaVerne Baldwin.
John B. Faust.
Edward P. Lowry.

James L. Park.
Clarence J. Spiker.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

Charles C. Stemmer, Cottonwood.
Freda B. Irwin, Gilbert.
Raymond W. Still, Tempe.

CALIFORNIA

Charles F. Evers, Fortuna.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate January 23 (legislative day of January 17), 1929

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Crate D. Bowen, of Florida, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Florida, which was sent to the Senate January 19, 1929, Mr. Bowen having declined to accept the appointment.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, January 23, 1929

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Spera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Eternal One, from whom all blessings flow, Thou art still blessing us, though we can not comprehend just why. These days quiver with duty, which is our watchword. It comes to us in silence, when we are alone, where the crowd is not seen nor heard. Again it is with us when we are in the surging multitudes. O Thou, who are mighty in word and in deed, teach us the right thing to do and the right way to go. Our Blessed Heavenly Father, may our performance of duty be the outstanding quality that shall command respect throughout our beloved land. We pause at the mercy seat a moment. God be with the sorrow-stricken colleague. The sweet, calm, supplicating voice is still; the door is shut. Help us to believe that there never was a cloud so black but it carries with it, somewhere, a brightness, hidden only because we are not on the other side. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 15472. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment for use at the Eleventh National Convention of the American Legion.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to amendments of the House to a bill and joint resolutions of the following titles:

S. 1156. An act granting a pension to Lois I. Marshall.

S. J. Res. 59. A joint resolution authorizing the President to ascertain, adjust, and pay certain claims of grain elevators and grain firms to cover insurance and interest on wheat during the years 1919 and 1920, as per a certain contract authorized by the President.

S. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a Federal reserve bank building in the city of Los Angeles, Calif.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1320. An act for the relief of James W. Pringle.

H. R. 4920. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to award a Nicaraguan campaign badge to Capt. James P. Williams in recognition of his services to the United States in the Nicaraguan campaign of 1912 and 1913.

H. R. 15569. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes.

INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I did not happen to be on the floor yesterday when the resolution relative to the inaugural proceedings was passed. I notice the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] made an inquiry relative to the parade. I want to say to the House that the Committee on the Inaugural Ceremonies of the Senate and House have made a definite request to have the parade pass across the plaza in front of the Capitol, and we have been assured by Colonel Grant and the gentlemen in command that such will be the case; that the parade will pass across the plaza.

In answer to several requests for information in regard to tickets, I will say that it is expected that we will build a grand stand out here of practically the same size as that of four years ago, to hold in the neighborhood of 8,000 people. After such distribution of tickets has been made to foreign embassies and representatives of other bodies as is customary on such occasions there will be about seven tickets for each Member, and in addition to that each House Member will have a ticket for himself, which will admit him to the Senate floor, and one ticket that will admit one guest to the Senate gallery. This ticket for the Member is rendered necessary for this reason: Four years ago, as gentlemen will remember, the Members of the House passed over to the Senate, and there was no place for them in the Senate, a great many people being on the Senate floor who had no right to be there. Each person here who is entitled to the privilege of the floor in the Senate at that time will be furnished with a distinctive ticket for that purpose. After the ceremonies in the Senate all the people on the Senate floor and in the Senate galleries will march out together to the central platform on the east side of the Capitol. Each Member of the House, as noted before, is provided with one ticket to the Senate galleries.

Down town, in what is known as the court of honor, on Lafayette Square, opposite the reviewing stand, there will be in the vicinity of 3,000 tickets reserved primarily for Members of the Senate and the House, and Members will have the first opportunity of buying those tickets up to three or four days prior to the inauguration.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. What will be the price?

Mr. SNELL. I do not know yet what the price will be.

I have here the program that was followed four years ago in connection with the ceremonies in the Senate. I do not know but that it would be proper to insert this program in the Record for the information of Members of the House. I do not know whether it will be absolutely followed. It is a tentative program.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, let me suggest to the gentleman that although it is likely that that will be the program, yet it might be confusing if changes should be made later. We will have the real program before long, and then that can be put in the Record. Otherwise it might prove confusing. However, I have no objection.

Mr. SNELL. I am not sure, of course, that it will be followed absolutely, and perhaps it would be just as well to put in that program a little later.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. My experience has been that there is very little variation in the program from time to time, but some new conditions may arise to cause some slight change.

Mr. SNELL. So far as we know at this time, that will be the program for the 4th of March.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I just thought it might be confusing.

Mr. SNELL. Then we will leave that out of the Record for the present.

Mr. POU. My information is that a great many inquiries have been made in regard to getting tickets for the inaugural stand out here. I understand there will be a record-breaking crowd in the city. Can the gentleman from New York give us an idea of how many tickets each Member will receive?

Mr. SNELL. About seven tickets. That will apply also to retiring Members, and each new coming Member elect will have two tickets.

Mr. POU. And in addition to the seven tickets for the Capitol stands the Members will have the preferential right to purchase tickets on the downtown stands?

Mr. SNELL. Yes; in the court of honor.

Mr. TILSON. The retiring Members will have the same number of tickets for the platform in front of the Capitol as the others, and the new Members elect, who are here for the first time, will have only two?

Mr. SNELL. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. TILSON. All Members of the House will march over to the Senate Chamber?

Mr. SNELL. Yes. They will march over, and each Member will have his ticket with him at that time. When the tickets are ready they will be distributed by the Sergeant at Arms of the House, and each Member will be called on to sign personally for those tickets.

APPOINTMENT OF MASTER SERGT. AUGUST J. MACK AS A WARRANT OFFICER, UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. MORIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Military Affairs, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 10472, to authorize the appointment of

Master Sergt. August J. Mack as a warrant officer, United States Army, concur in the Senate amendment, and pass the bill.

The SPEAKER. By authorization of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House bill 10472, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the same. The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill and the Senate amendment.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman whether this is the unanimous request of the committee?

Mr. MORIN. Yes; I so stated in my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

REREFERENCE OF A BILL

Mr. MORIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to rerefer the bill H. R. 16036, to authorize the cession to the city of New York of land on the northerly side of New Dorp Lane in exchange for permission to connect Miller Field with the said city's public sewer system, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to rerefer House bill 16036 from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to the Committee on Military Affairs. Is there objection?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that is the bill, as I understand it, which refers to land that is under the jurisdiction of the War Department and over which the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has no jurisdiction?

Mr. MORIN. Yes; it is land in New York.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is that the New York bill?

Mr. MORIN. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is land in a military reservation?

Mr. MORIN. Yes.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the rereference will be made.

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 16422) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, and for other purposes. Pending that I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate to-day be controlled equally by myself and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CASEY].

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the agreement made yesterday with reference to general debate would hold to-day.

Mr. TILSON. But the gentleman asks that the control of the time be transferred to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CASEY], the time yesterday being controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 16422, and pending that asks unanimous consent that general debate to-day be controlled one-half by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CASEY]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 16422, with Mr. HOOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am asking this time merely for the purpose of presenting a letter which I received setting forth a proposition for a White House in the country. It comes from a reputable man and I think it is worthy of consideration.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Has the gentleman conferred with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] with reference to this request?

Mr. COLE of Iowa. No; I have not, but I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts would not think of offering an objection to this letter.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Well, he thinks of offering objections to requests of this sort.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. It is a short letter.

Mr. BANKHEAD. He has prevented a number of requests made on this side from being granted by his objections.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting the letter referred to?

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

HOLLY STOVER (INC.),
Washington, D. C., December 17, 1928.

HON. CYRENUS COLE,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: President Coolidge recently set forth many good reasons for the establishment of a permanent summer White House in the vicinity of Washington, and, in view of the general public interest in the proposal, this appears to be an appropriate time to call attention to an excellent site for the location of such an establishment.

Several prospective places have been mentioned, each of which has some of the qualifications that are necessary, but there is no more ideal spot in the world for such a home than at the summit of Cave Hill, at Grottoes, Va. Situated in the southern part of the Shenandoah Valley, Cave Hill commands a superb outlook on the surrounding valley that is bounded on the east by the beautiful Blue Ridge and on the west by the towering Alleghenies. At the foot of Cave Hill the Shenandoah River winds its way on toward the Potomac and offers the opportunity for boating, bathing, and fishing—forms of entertainment not to be found at many country locations. Cave Hill is close to the southern entrance to the Shenandoah National Park and, if located there, our future Presidents and their families would have easy access to the trails and highways in that national reserve.

The high altitude at Cave Hill assures comfort all through the summer months and the thin mountain air is pure and invigorating. Here will be found an abundance of fine mineral and lithia springs and just a short distance away are located some of the most famous of the Virginia springs.

In addition to its other attractions, the geographical location of Cave Hill commends it for such a purpose. It is just close enough to Washington, Charlottesville, Roanoke, and Staunton to make easy the transaction of necessary business, and yet it is far enough from these centers of population to assure the necessary seclusion. Here our Presidents' home would be hidden away from the idle curious, and they would be as free and happy as if they were on their own private domain. Three splendid highways from Washington lead directly to Cave Hill, and, by motor, only five or six hours are required for the trip. A station of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway is close by and the journey from Washington on the Cincinnati express is but a short afternoon trip.

Cave Hill is a part of the acreage that belongs to Grand Caverns and it affords me pleasure to offer to the Government, free of charge, all the land that would be required for the establishment of the summer White House. Investigation will reveal the truth of the statements I have made here, and I am certain that the location will be found particularly desirable in all ways.

It will be greatly appreciated and esteemed a personal favor if you will convey our offer to the committee, or officials who will attend to the matter.

Sincerely yours,

HOLLY STOVER.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one hour.

Last year in my discussion of this bill I went at length into the subject of fiscal relations between the United States and the District of Columbia. It does not seem necessary to take the time of the House for such a detailed statement at this time. I will, however, discuss briefly the Bureau of Efficiency report on fiscal relations and briefly outline the situation as it is affected by this bill.

On January 11, 1929, I presented to the House the report of the Bureau of Efficiency on fiscal relations between the United States and the District of Columbia. This report was made at the request of the late Martin B. Madden, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The Bureau of Efficiency had but one instruction, to report facts to the Congress. Mr. Madden believed that the Congress knew the facts, believed that the United States was dealing not only justly but liberally with the District of Columbia. He welcomed any fact not

known, believing that the Congress in the possession of the facts would fairly decide this issue. Various studies have heretofore been made by Members of this House, none of which were acceptable to those citizens of Washington who in season and out constantly demand more and more from the Federal Treasury. The report from the bureau was asked for in the hope that, as an independent study, it might bring this constant complaint against the Congress to an end. The report has been made. The report accepts as its basis the premises heretofore outlined by District citizens as the proper ones on which to reach a decision—and from that basis the report in its determination of facts fully supports the position heretofore taken and maintained by the House of Representatives.

The report determines first that the liability of the Federal Government, were it a taxpayer, would in the fiscal year 1928 have been \$7,440,939. It then states that after deducting this "tax liability" from the "\$9,000,000 lump-sum contribution \$1,559,061 was left to be applied against" the Federal Government's "liability on account of the loss of revenue and on account of extraordinary expenditures occasioned by the fact that Washington is the National Capital." In that statement the report grants to the District everything that the most enthusiastic opponents of the \$9,000,000 lump-sum plan have demanded. It gives no credit to the Government of the United States for the use of buildings and land owned by the United States, a normal rental of which would be \$150,000—see hearings, pages 44, 45, 46. It gives no credit to the United States for property given to the District last year amounting to \$27,356.84—see hearings, page 48. It gives no credit to the United States for the services of 10 Army officers in municipal capacities at salaries amounting to \$42,137—see hearings, page 46. It gives no credit to the United States for the services rendered to the District by such Federal agencies as the Bureau of the Budget, the Bureau of Efficiency, the Bureau of Standards, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the many services in one capacity and another rendered the District by the Federal Government that are too numerous to detail and impossible to estimate—all, however, being services not rendered to any other American city by the United States and services given to the municipal government without charge.

Last, but by no means least, the report does not even suggest that the United States should be given either credit or consideration for the maintenance here of the largest business in the world—the Government of the United States—the maintenance of an army of employees here at an ever-increasing pay roll of approximately \$140,000,000 a year that is not affected either by flood or drought, or by famine or overproduction. Business depression does not reach it. Washington, due to the location here of the seat of government, is the only city in America that is assured of a permanent and growing prosperity. The business of the Government brings multiplied thousands to this city, spending millions in Washington annually; the tourist and those who come here to see their Government in action or to worship at her shrines bring other millions to the tills of Washington's business houses; still other thousands come to make this their home, drawn by the advantages, social, official, and educational, that the Government provides, all contributing vast amounts to the prosperity, the business, and the growth of Washington.

The report suggests no credit to the United States for the multiplied millions spent here in buildings, grounds, and shrines or those that hereafter will be spent. Likewise, the report suggests that the United States be charged with "taxes" on its property here—every dollar of it—completely ignoring the fact that no city in America save Washington has the temerity to ask that the Government of the United States contribute to its revenues in lieu of taxes. Every large city of America has valuable Government-owned properties in their midst from which no city revenue is derived. The Government even refuses to pave the streets in front of its own property in every city of America save Washington, and yet this report does not even suggest that the United States should have a deduction or "exemption" equivalent to that which it receives in other cities. Every dollar of Federal property in the District used for Federal purposes is to be "taxed" here in the Nation's Capital—entirely ignoring the exemptions that the Federal Government rightly enjoys in every city of America.

The report gives no credit to the United States for the great increase to the value of private property given by such Federal improvements as the new bridge across the Potomac, adding at least \$15,000,000 to the taxable values of the District, the bridge itself a benefit for which the District makes no payment but receives all the advantages. Other illustrations without number may be used.

The report holds that we should pay in excess of a tax comparable to other property holders. It then suggests another and an indefinite obligation to pay other moneys to the District

but it gives no credit to your Government and mine for the benefit that this city receives from the Federal Government that no other city receives.

The report refers to a "liability on account of the loss of revenue" occasioned by the fact that Washington is the National Capital, and likewise refers to "extraordinary expenditures" occasioned by the same fact.

What revenues have been lost by the fact that Washington is the seat of government? None can be established. There are those who imagine that were this not the Nation's Capital that factories and other activities would come. Possibly so—but at best a rather unsatisfactory basis upon which to predicate a charge of "loss of revenue." Certainly to be set off against that are the definitely easily established millions of dollars that are drawn here by the "fact that Washington is the National Capital," that would not come here for any other reason. My own opinion is that the actual "loss of revenue" to Washington were this not the National Capital would be far greater than any imaginary "loss of revenue" caused by the fact that it is the Capital.

The charge that there is a "loss of revenue" here "by the fact that Washington is the National Capital" and that therefore there is a "liability" on the part of the United States to contribute to the District on account of that "loss." The loss, of course, can not be proven. The inference from the statement is that Washington, were it not the Capital, would be permitted a greater control of its own destinies; that industries would come, and so forth. The charge is that Washington, in comparison with other cities, is retarded in its growth, handicapped by the presence here of the Nation's Capital.

What are the facts? In 1906 Washington was the fifteenth city of the country on a population basis, with a population of 307,716. In 1911 Washington was the seventeenth city, with a population of 337,476. In 1916 Washington was the seventeenth city of the Nation, with a population of 361,329. In 1921 Washington was the fourteenth city of the Nation, with a population of 448,541. In 1926 Washington was the thirteenth city of the Nation, with a population of 525,000.

So it is clear that Washington is not only not being retarded by the presence here of the Nation's Capital but the city is rapidly gaining in population and is going ahead of "industrial" cities because of the fact that "Washington is the National Capital."

Considering the admitted fact of Washington's very rapid development in population and gain over other cities, may I refer to the statement of Mr. William P. Richards, assessor for the District, appearing on page 560 and following, from which I quote to show that Washington has had no "loss of revenues," and that there is no merit in that claim:

The growth of real-estate values in any city will depend in great measure on the growth of its population. Many are led to think that moneys in bank, stocks, goods, and mortgages express the wealth of a community, but these are forms of wealth depending primarily on the use of land. In fact, the United States census in estimating the wealth of the country includes only real estate and tangible personal property. That is, the census listed physical properties and ignored evidences of debt or intangible values. For example, if real estate worth \$10,000 has a mortgage of \$5,000 attached to it, there can be no true measure of value in the sum of the two figures. Real estate is not only the foundation of our true wealth but the real-estate value of any city gives us an exact measure of its relative importance. We know that our large cities are our wealthy cities and that our small ones need hardly be mentioned as having wealth, yet when the real-estate value of a large city is divided by its population giving a per capita value we find that the small city will be in close accord in its per capita value.

Therefore wealth as applied to real estate increases in all cities just as the population increases—that is, all cities that grow increase proportionately in value—and it is not surprising that the District of Columbia has increased in population and wealth at the same rate as shown by the growth of the United States.

Washington and the District of Columbia have, therefore, from all indications a future in growth of wealth that seems to be assured and steady. We have no bonded debt to consume in interest a part of our taxes. We have a pay roll from the Government that is steady and certain from month to month and year to year. Depression in business is not felt within the District in the same manner as it is in other cities, and the program of national improvements, which is bound in some near future to be carried out, will be still more material gain to our District wealth.

We are able to draw the following conclusions with respect to the changes of real-estate values, both here and elsewhere: That the real-estate values of a city will increase in direct proportion with its increase in population.

That purchases of parks and playgrounds; the building of monumental public buildings; the improvement of public highways; model

provisions for education and for protection to life and property; all when accomplished within certain bounds, will increase the wealth of a city and thereby attract population. But in the end the per capita wealth will have been changed very little.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. KNUTSON. Who pays for the maintenance of our parks in Washington?

Mr. SIMMONS. Outside of the reservations around Federal buildings, they are carried in the District bill.

What are the "extraordinary expenditures occasioned by the fact that Washington is the National Capital"? In the hearings and report a year ago and in the subsequent discussions on the District bill, we took up and examined the claims of "extraordinary expenditures" advanced by the board of trade, chamber of commerce, and others, and one by one they were examined and one by one they were abandoned by their proponents.

These observations have been made not so much with the thought of "finding fault" with the bureau report as they have been made with the idea of demonstrating that the report, to say the least, is not unfriendly to the District and most certainly is not biased in favor of the United States.

It is not my purpose here to go into a detailed analysis of the tables in the report. They are printed and available as House Document No. 506. Two conclusions are readily drawn from the report:

First. That the United States is not only fully meeting and paying every obligation that could possibly come to it were it a taxpayer, but, in addition, is contributing over and above all that a considerable and generous sum and more than meeting its obligations toward the Capital City.

Second. That the city of Washington is not only not overtaxed, but, in fact, is undertaxed in comparison with other cities. That the low taxes here have not resulted in an undernourished city, but that, on the contrary, Washington, when compared with other cities, is developing in all its city activities without undue curtailment of funds.

The position of the House on fiscal relations and the contribution made by the United States to the District of Columbia is fully supported by this report. I commend a study of the report to those Members of the House who are interested in the details of city expenditures, and revenues generally, as well as in the Capital City.

It is interesting to note that the United States, on the basis of being a "taxpayer," has put 22.2 per cent of the "taxable" real property of the District, upon which the Bureau of Efficiency figure a "tax" of \$5,452,767. Then the bureau arrives at a "tax" of \$1,536,315 upon tangible personal property for the year 1928. It should be noted that the total collections for the District on tangible personal property in 1928 amounts to but \$1,470,203. These figures charge the United States with 51 per cent of the taxable tangible personal property of the District. Clearly one of two things follow. Either the figure for the United States is excessive, or else the owner of tangible personal property in the District is escaping the payment of taxes on that class of property. Whichever conclusion is reached, it leaves the District taxpayer in an advantageous position as compared with the United States.

The Bureau of Efficiency then, by a purely arbitrary method with which I do not now quarrel, charges the United States with an intangible personal property tax of \$451,857. The justice of "charging" the United States with an intangible personal "tax" is subject to serious question. But without discussing that, may I point out that in 1928 the District collected on intangible personal property \$2,378,569.28, as against the \$451,857 which the Bureau of Efficiency here charge to the United States. The Federal "intangible tax" is then 16 per cent of the whole.

We have then this table of percentages available on which to judge the fairness of the "tax charge" against the United States:

Real property tax payable by United States, 22.2 per cent of the total.

Personal tangible property tax payable by the United States, 51 per cent of the whole.

Personal intangible property tax payable by the United States, 16 per cent of the whole.

I suggest that in view of the fact that the 22.2 per cent real property is based upon the District assessor's figures, that the same percentage could rightly be applied to tangible and intangible personal property in lieu of the method used which obviously reaches a result unfair to the Federal Government when compared with the comparative amount paid by the Dis-

trict taxpayer on personal tangible property. We would then have a charge or "tax" of—

Real property	\$5,452,767
Tangible personality	419,518
Intangible personality	678,718
Total	6,551,003

I suggest that a total "tax liability" of \$6,551,003 is far nearer correct than is the \$7,440,939 proposed by the Bureau of Efficiency. This figure is somewhat larger than I arrived at last year due to the inclusion in part of intangible property. But either figure shows that.

Whichever of the three tables are accepted, the present contribution of the United States is shown to be not only fair but very generous to the people of the District.

The report discloses that in 1915 the Federal property, including park property, constituted 36.8 per cent of the whole. In 1928 it was but 28.3 per cent of the whole, or when park property is excluded in 1915 the Federal property was 28.2 per cent of the whole and in 1928 but 22.2 per cent of the whole.

Demand is made by District taxpayers that Congress return to a percentage basis of contribution instead of the lump sum now carried and that the percentage paid by the United States be 40 or 50 per cent of the total. These figures disclose the reason for the demand and also why, in fairness to the United States, neither of these requests can be granted.

If the ratio between privately owned and federally owned property remained constant year after year, then the percentage plan of payment would be as fair a basis of contribution as the lump sum. But the ratio does not remain constant. The percentage of federally owned property is constantly decreasing and the percentage of privately owned property constantly increasing. It is perfectly obvious therefore that a fixed percentage under those circumstances would inevitably mean relatively increased "taxes" to the United States and decreased taxes to the private property owner. That is likewise the obvious reason that the fixed percentage basis is demanded by the District taxpayer. If the United States in 1915 owned for Federal purposes 28.2 per cent of the property and in 1928 but 22.2 per cent of the property, then a percentage in 1915 that was fair both to the United States and the District taxpayer would in 1928 be unfair to the United States and decidedly favorable to the District taxpayer.

Likewise these figures clearly show why the Federal contribution has properly decreased comparatively during the recent years that have witnessed a rapid development of private property in the District. Demand is made that the United States carry 40 per cent of the cost of the city government, and yet this report discloses that the United States owns and uses for Federal purposes but 22.2 per cent of the property of the District. Is it fair to ask 22.2 per cent of the property to pay 40 per cent of the taxes?

The lump-sum contribution of \$9,000,000 carried in this bill pays 28 per cent of the total paid from general revenues, which again discloses that the United States, owning but 22.2 per cent of the property, is carrying its full share of the load. This is approximately the same percentage as has been paid during the past two years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I notice some contention in the public press that the percentage of Government-owned property is increasing, but I understand from the figures just given that the reverse of that is true.

Mr. SIMMONS. The reverse of that is true. In 1915 we used for Federal purposes, according to the assessor, 28.2 per cent of the property. Due to the increase in the values in the development of private property in the District, that figure is now down to 22.2 per cent.

What would the \$9,000,000 Federal contribution pay?

Based upon this bill, the \$9,000,000 contributed by the Federal Government to the District of Columbia would pay the cost of the police department, the fire department, the health department, the courts and prisons, the public buildings and parks, including \$1,000,000 for the purchase of land under the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and the Zoo. There is then left for the people of the District to pay the general salary items, contingent and miscellaneous expenses, street and road improvement and repair, sewers, collection and disposal of refuse, the electrical department, the schools, the public welfare. The water service is self-supporting. The gas tax pays \$1,600,000 of the \$3,785,100 carried in the street and road improvement and repair item.

Upon the items in the bill, if the 60-40 plan were in force, the District would be called upon to pay only for the general salaries of the city, contingent and miscellaneous expenses, street

and road improvement and repair, public schools, the health department, and public welfare.

While the United States would be asked to pay for the sewer system, the collection and disposal of refuse, public playgrounds, the electrical department, including all street lighting, and so forth, police and fire departments, courts and prisons, parks and buildings, including the \$1,000,000 for new park land under the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and the Zoo.

To state it thus is to show how utterly absurd and unfair it is to ask that there be a return to 60-40.

Accepting the Bureau of Efficiency values of real, personal, tangible, and intangible property, we are charging in this bill against the United States the equivalent of a \$2.10 tax rate while the District taxpayer enjoys a rate of \$1.70 in comparison. If the 60-40 plan were returned to, the United States rate would be \$3.15 and the District rate \$1.15 in comparison.

Bear in mind always that the District tax rate included all taxes generally separated elsewhere into school district, sanitary district, city, county, and State taxes. If the 60-40 plan were accepted for the fiscal year 1930, the United States would be called upon to contribute \$13,070,728 and the District would be called upon to contribute \$21,091,092 from its general tax revenues, while under the lump-sum plan the United States contributes \$9,000,000, plus other items mentioned elsewhere, and the District taxpayer contributes \$26,151,820.

Tables upon which this is based will be inserted in the RECORD.

It is interesting to note that on a 60-40 basis the real property charge against District property would be \$13,374,500, as against a Federal contribution of \$13,070,728. Or the United States, under the 60-40 plan, would be called upon to pay \$1 into the treasury of the District for every dollar collected from real-estate taxes in the District. The 60-40 plan, then, actually means a 50-50 so far as the average taxpayer in the District is concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield again for a question?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In answer to the question I asked a moment ago, the gentleman gave the percentage of Government-owned property and privately owned property in the District. Is that based upon the percentage of valuation or the percentage of area? I presume it is upon valuation.

Mr. SIMMONS. Percentage of valuation. I have accepted all through the assessor's values of the District.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman stated just now that under the 60-40 plan the Federal contribution would be about \$13,000,000?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRAMTON. In that connection, if we returned to the old plan by which we had our 40 per cent share in the fines and fees and licenses, and so forth, there would be probably \$800,000 or \$900,000 coming back to us from the \$13,000,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; that amount is exclusive of such receipts. The gross figure on a 60-40 basis is \$14,060,728.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is what I wanted to be sure about.

Mr. SIMMONS. And that has grown now to about \$1,000,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. But the \$13,000,000 would be exclusive of that?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TILSON. Has the gentleman a table showing the comparative taxation of property in the District as compared with other cities of the country of comparable size?

Mr. SIMMONS. That is all in the report of the Bureau of Efficiency, which has been printed and is available this morning. It comprises about 50 pages of printed matter.

Mr. TILSON. Then it does appear clearly in that report?

Mr. SIMMONS. It shows that the District, on the average, is under the average in tax loads and expenditures.

Particular attention should be called to the fact that the United States is not paying \$9,000,000 out of the total of \$41,265,250 carried by the bill. The United States is paying \$9,000,000 out of \$35,151,820.

The balance of the District revenues, to wit, \$6,113,430, are derived from trust funds, the gas tax, water revenues, and miscellaneous revenues.

The total expenditures in this bill, including the supplemental estimates submitted by the Bureau of the Budget at our request, can all be paid out of the estimated 1930 revenues and leave a surplus of \$1,863,180 to take care of deficiencies, new legislation, and so forth.

Tax rate for 1930 on assumption of 60-40 appropriation basis for that, based on total recommendations of committee

Amount recommended in bill.....	\$41,265,250
Less trust and special funds and items payable from gasoline-tax fund and water fund.....	6,113,430
	35,151,820

40 per cent of divisible items payable by the United States.....	14,060,728
60 per cent of divisible items payable by the District of Columbia.....	21,091,092
	35,151,820
	21,091,092

60 per cent payable by the District of Columbia.....	\$2,600,000
Tax on intangibles.....	2,200,000
Tax on public utilities, etc.....	1,985,000
Miscellaneous revenues (less \$1,015,000 to the United States).....	13,374,500
Tax rate of \$1.15 on real estate (assessment of \$1,163,000,000).....	1,230,500
Tax rate of \$1.15 on tangible personal property (assessment of \$107,000,000).....	21,390,000

Tax rate of \$1.15 on above basis would raise in 1930 excess revenue of.....	298,908
--	---------

Tax rate for 1930 based on total of recommendations of committee (\$9,000,000 contributed by United States)

Amount recommended in bill.....	\$41,265,250
Less trust funds, gasoline tax fund items and water-fund items.....	6,113,430
	35,151,820

Add:	
Police and fire pensions.....	550,000
Refunding taxes.....	60,000
Street extension awards.....	500,000
District of Columbia part of accrued liability, employees' retirement fund.....	150,000
Freedmen's Hospital, one-half.....	115,000
	36,526,820

United States contribution.....	9,000,000
Tax on intangible personal property.....	2,600,000
Tax on public utilities, etc.....	2,200,000
Miscellaneous revenues.....	3,000,000
Tax rate of \$1.70 on real estate (assessment of \$1,163,000,000).....	19,771,000
Tax rate of \$1.70 on tangible personal property (assessment of \$107,000,000).....	1,819,000
	38,390,000

Total.....	38,390,000
------------	------------

Excess revenues under \$1.70 tax rate for 1930 (reserve for supplemental and deficiency appropriations, etc.).....	1,863,180
--	-----------

Attention is called to the table on page 41 of the hearings. The United States, by the substitution of the \$9,000,000 lump-sum contribution for the 60-40 plan, releases to the District government miscellaneous revenues which under the 60-40 plan would otherwise be credited to the United States. In 1928 those revenues amounted to \$865,339. It is estimated that they will equal \$895,000 in 1929, and in 1930, \$990,000. This, of course, should be considered in addition to the \$9,000,000 Federal contribution, for its revenues that the District would not receive under the 60-40 plan.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Has the gentleman got the figures showing how much we collect from automobile taxes?

Mr. SIMMONS. The gentleman means automobile licenses?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Automobile licenses or taxes.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not have it in this statement, but it is over \$100,000 a year.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That goes into the improvement of the streets, I presume?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOWREY. The gentleman stated that the District is undertaxed, according to the report referred to. Can the gentleman tell us in about what proportion the District is undertaxed as compared with other cities of its size?

Mr. SIMMONS. That goes into the complete table of the Bureau of Efficiency report of about 50 pages separating the taxes into various groups, both revenues and expenditures, and you would have to study the entire report in order to arrive at that answer. The report is available in the committee room if the gentleman cares to have it.

I regret that the Bureau of Efficiency have not submitted to the Congress tables of the various other taxes that enter into the revenues of a city and the tax cost to its citizens. I am advised that this material will be submitted and included in the main report. In my judgment the charge for water in Washington is exceedingly low. How does it compare with other cities? The \$1 a car auto-license cost in Washington is absurdly low. What do other cities pay? The gas tax here of

2 cents a gallon is the lowest rate charged by any tax body. Maryland charges 4 cents and Virginia 5 cents. License and gas tax revenues here are spent on the city streets. License and gas tax moneys collected in most cities are spent on country roads.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That is the item I wanted to know about—the gas tax.

Mr. SIMMONS. The gas tax amounts to about \$1,500,000. I can not give the exact figures now.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want to say to the gentleman that in Maryland a certain proportion of the gas tax and the license tax goes to the city of Baltimore and is not spent on the roads.

Mr. SIMMONS. Baltimore gets a division of it, but even a part of the money collected in Baltimore is spent on country roads.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Oh, yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. What advantage does Washington have as a result of it over other cities? No inheritance tax is levied in the District. What is the status of other jurisdictions?

What are the comparative corporation tax rates between Washington and other cities and States? Here few such charges are made.

The head of a family in the District has exempt from taxation household goods, and so forth, of the value of \$1,000. What are the exemptions elsewhere?

The District levies no poll tax. What of other jurisdictions? Every State but five has one in some form.

What about license taxes and general franchise taxes?

Last year I discussed these questions briefly before the House on May 25, 1928, my remarks then being incorporated in House Document No. 330.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the gentleman state what is received by the District from license taxes?

Mr. SIMMONS. That statement is in the hearings. I could not give it offhand.

Mr. GIBSON. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that I will introduce to-day a bill covering the levy of license taxes, which materially increases the amount that will be received by the District.

Mr. SIMMONS. They will crucify you, too.

Mr. GIBSON. Well, I am used to that.

Mr. SIMMONS. What other taxing jurisdiction in America gives an exemption from taxation to intangibles comparable to those given by the District and listed on page 23 of House Document No. 330?

Washington taxes tangible personal property at a rate of \$1.70 a hundred; intangibles are taxed at 50 cents a hundred. Do other tax bodies give intangibles a rate of less than 30 per cent of the tangible rate?

Is there another city in America that receives contributions from the Federal Government toward its general expenses? Is there another city of the United States without bonded or other indebtedness? Is there another city of the United States with a cash free surplus of approximately \$7,000,000?

Each Member may be able to answer these and other questions as they apply to his own State and be thereby able to judge of the tax burdens of Washington. The answer to some of them may be found in the report.

Clearly the report establishes that the lump sum, and not the percentage plan of contribution, is the proper one, and clearly the report establishes the fact that the present contribution is ample and generous to the District. The report, while favorable to the District in every basis of calculation, clearly supports the position taken and maintained by the House of Representatives.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Has the gentleman taken any pains to ascertain, or did the bureau which has made this report make any attempt to ascertain, how closely the tax on intangibles is collected here?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; we have asked for a supplemental study of that angle of it by them. It is not involved in this report so far as I have discovered.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. About what is derived now from intangibles?

Mr. SIMMONS. About \$2,500,000. I stated the figure a moment ago, and it is approximately that amount.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On the question of surplus, did I understand the gentleman to say that the District has a surplus of \$7,000,000 unexpended?

Mr. SIMMONS. Seven million dollars; yes. I am coming to that in a moment.

Mr. GIBSON. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GIBSON. Reverting to the matter of the amount received from licensing of automobiles, did the gentleman state the amount received by the District?

Mr. SIMMONS. It is over \$100,000. It is \$1 a car, and we have a little over 100,000 cars in the District.

Mr. GIBSON. We have more than 140,000 cars in the District, I think.

Mr. SIMMONS. The figure has grown. I am using figures of last year. I do not have the figures available for this year.

Mr. GIBSON. In addition to the \$1 per car, is there not a personal tax levied?

Mr. SIMMONS. There is a personal-property tax levied, but practically in all instances not paid. We carry in this bill a provision which, if allowed to stay in the bill, will require that they shall show the payment of personal taxes on their cars before they can get their licenses for the next year. At the present time they go to the license bureau, give a fictitious address as their place of residence, get their licenses for their automobiles, and there is no way to follow up on the car to find it ever for personal taxes.

Mr. GIBSON. May I make this suggestion: If the same amount is collected in the District from automobile owners as is collected in my State, the District, in place of receiving \$100,000, would receive a little in excess of \$4,200,000.

Mr. HOLADAY. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say that the amount received in the District for automobile licenses was \$156,000 plus.

Mr. SIMMONS. You will find in the hearings, page 572, the report of the Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research for 1928. This is a private and not a governmental study. It is not my purpose to comment at length upon it. Those who care to do so may compare it with the Bureau of Efficiency report. By comparison between the two reports it is very evident that the Bureau of Efficiency report is decidedly favorable to the District taxpayer.

Again the old cry is raised that the district is compelled to furnish "free water" to the United States. There is no truth in the statement and yet the newspapers and others repeat over and over again the charge, possibly hoping by repeated statements to cause some one to believe that it is so. Reference is made to the table inserted in the record on page 507. The water system of Washington is a self-supporting enterprise. Appropriations for salaries, extensions, and betterments for operation and maintenance are all paid out of the water revenues. No part of the cost is reflected in the tax bill of the District resident. Of the capital invested in the plant the United States has contributed \$12,311,887.66. The District of Columbia has contributed \$10,353,036.93. The plant then is owned jointly by the United States and the District of Columbia, with the United States, as usual, paying the greater share.

Twenty-six million one hundred and seventy-five thousand seven hundred and fourteen dollars and thirty-one cents of the cost of the system has been paid for by the application of earnings of the system to its extension and betterment. In the fiscal year 1928 the value of the water used by the United States was \$251,175, while the value of the water used by the District of Columbia was \$775,074.

On the basis of water used, the United States received a return on its investment in the system of 2.04 per cent. On the same basis the District of Columbia received a return of 7.46 per cent on its investment. It is therefore perfectly obvious that due to the generosity of the United States in furnishing more than 50 per cent of the capital invested in the water system, the District, as usual, occupies an advantageous position. These facts ought to dispose of the charge that the District gives "free water" to the United States. I have no hope that it will.

Likewise, due to the generosity of the United States in furnishing 54 per cent of the capital invested in the system, the domestic users of Washington receive a pure and ample water supply at one of the lowest costs in any American city.

Last year the committee in order to bring the employees of the District of Columbia up to the average of salaries in the same grades in the Federal service added \$121,245 to the salary estimates received from the Bureau of the Budget, making a total of \$175,000, stipulating that this payment should go to those grades where the lower salary rates applied. It was contemplated at that time that an additional increase this year of \$170,000 in salaries would be necessary to secure the expressed desire of the committee. The increases granted last year have been made in accordance with the intention of the committee. Those salary increases affected approximately 50 per cent of the District force. At the time the committee took that action the passage of the Welch Act was not contemplated. The Welch Act, passed in the last few days of the session, applied to District as well as Federal employees. As construed

and applied it granted pay increases to all employees of the District and to many employees two increases in pay schedules. Following the adjournment of Congress the question was raised as to whether or not the Welch Act superseded the "set-ups" given by the Congress in the last District bill. I advised the District officials that it was my opinion that the Welch Act increases were in addition to and not in lieu of the increases granted by Congress. The interpretation I suggested was followed. The net result of the whole transaction was that the District employees received under the increases carried in the District bill last year \$175,641. The Welch Act added \$557,802 to the pay roll of the District government over and above the \$175,641 granted by the committee. The total of the two bills reached \$733,433 in salary increases last year in the District government. All District employees during the last year received one increase in pay, better than 50 per cent received two increases, and many of them three increases.

Detailed studies of the salary schedules have again been made and appear in the hearings beginning on page 53. Particular attention is called to the statement beginning on page 57 of the departments and establishments of the Federal Government where the average is either lower or not higher than the District average of salaries. These tables show that the operation of the Welch Act and the increases granted last year by the committee have brought the average of the District salaries to an advantageous comparison with Federal salaries. The purpose of the committee has been accomplished; the salary increases contemplated last year have been already granted; additional increases are not justified and the committee has not granted them. In this connection it is proper to call attention to the fact that the amendment and liberalization of the Welch Act is being urged upon the Congress. No prophecy is ventured as to the effect of the new proposals.

Prior to the holding of hearings on this bill study was given to the fiscal condition of the District of Columbia. Briefly a very satisfactory situation exists. On June 30, 1928, the District of Columbia had on deposit in the Treasury of the United States, over and above all obligations, a free balance of \$6,126,600. That free unobligated balance will be on June 30, 1929, approximately \$7,186,752. The estimated revenues of the District for the fiscal year 1930 covered by this bill are \$33,390,000. The bill as sent us from the Bureau of the Budget called for expenditures of \$33,787,792 and thereby would have created this year an estimated surplus above expenditures of \$3,227,000.

Without increases by way of deficiency appropriations or new legislation and assuming the passage of the bill sent us by the Bureau of the Budget there would have been a surplus in the Treasury on June 30, 1930, of approximately \$10,400,000 over and above all obligations.

By the act of June 29, 1922, the District was required to create a surplus sufficient to keep on a cash basis at all times. That sum has been fixed at \$4,000,000. I agree that the reserved amount is a proper one. It is customary likewise to reserve \$1,000,000 to take care of subsequent appropriations and new legislation.

Deducting that \$5,000,000 it is obvious that additional appropriations from \$4,000,000 to \$5,000,000 can be made without jeopardizing the finances of the District. In our judgment those appropriations should be made for needed betterments—they can be made without increased taxes in the District or the Federal contribution.

Accordingly we asked the city officials to submit their estimates of needed betterments. Informal conferences were then held with the Bureau of the Budget and at our request estimates for betterments in the District were submitted, as follows:

Public library, land.....	\$35,000
District repair shop.....	205,000
Repairs to Anacostia River Bridge.....	120,000
Park View School.....	265,000
Buchanan School.....	120,000
School sites.....	109,000
Salary, supreme court.....	10,000
Nurses' home at Gallinger Hospital.....	150,000
Railing and walk at Hains Point.....	40,000
Additional park land.....	400,000
Reptile house at Zoo.....	120,000

Total.....1,674,000

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I will.

Mr. TILSON. How much is recommended for the purchase of land to complete the Rock Creek Parkway connection between Potomac Park and Rock Creek Park?

Mr. SIMMONS. I expect to come to that later; but we are carrying this year a million dollars against \$800,000 last year and \$600,000 the year before.

Mr. TILSON. How is that paid?

Mr. SIMMONS. Out of the District revenue. For the actual work in Rock Creek Park we have given them this year \$32,000

for material and \$52,000 for labor in order that the driveway under Calvert Street Bridge may be completed during the coming year.

These additional betterments can be made out of 1930 estimated revenues.

It is the consensus of opinion that the city should purchase and begin the development of a municipal center. The President has approved the plan to purchase two blocks south of the present Judiciary Square. I have introduced the legislation that will authorize the appropriation of the needed moneys. The District has the money to pay the cost of this land purchase if the legislative committee will secure the authority for the appropriation to be made. I would like to see the appropriation carried in the last deficiency bill of this Congress to purchase the land and begin plans for the construction of this plant.

The expenditures carried in this bill by way of supplemental estimates plus the proposed expenditures for the municipal center will probably reduce the surplus as far as it should be reduced at this time.

I have introduced a bill authorizing the appropriation of \$10,000,000 for additional school buildings and grounds. The bill is without condition as to when the appropriations are to be made or where schools are to be located or the kind of schools. It leaves the Congress free each year to appropriate to meet the needs then demonstrated. It binds neither the Congress nor the Board of Education to a fixed program for a series of years. It will allow the Congress to meet every situation as it arises, and in my judgment is the best way to secure the continuance of an efficient modern school system in this city.

Commenting upon this bill, the Washington Times on January 17, 1929, editorially stated:

Mr. SIMMONS has children of his own in the public schools of Washington, and he has personally studied conditions. He realizes that congestion in the schools is serious and that thousands of school children are being deprived of their rightful opportunities. He knows, beyond question, that many new school buildings are needed, and that many of those now in use are antiquated and practically unfit for pupils and teachers, lacking even proper sanitary and heating facilities.

I prefer to state my own position and ideas on the District schools. In certain parts of the city there is congestion due to rapid development of residential areas that could not have been anticipated. Adequate steps are being taken to relieve those conditions. There are 81,000 seats now in the District schools. When the building program now under way and carried in the bill is completed there will be a total of 90,000 seats. There are not to exceed 75,000 pupils in the District schools. So that there is space in the District schools for every student. The difficulty has been that in the shifting of the population, and the necessity for maintaining independent schools for both white and colored, often in the same neighborhood, that congestion has arisen in certain areas. That is being corrected, but on the whole the Washington schools are not congested, and no child is being deprived of educational opportunities in the District because of the building situation.

New buildings are needed to meet the requirements of a growing city; likewise, a policy of building replacements will be carried out. These conditions are to be expected in a growing, prosperous city. I do not see the schools in the gloomy way that this editor does. The condition is not as he describes it.

As an indication of the progress that is being made, let me cite one situation. In 1920 there were 360 part-time classes in the District schools. That number has now been reduced to 221, all of which are first or second grade pupils. The entire tendency now among school people is toward shorter school hours for the younger pupils. No material harm is being done these children. The condition of the schools is the best it has been for a long series of years, and they are constantly improving.

This bill provides for two additions to existing schools, not carried in the bill as it originally came to us—Parkview, \$265,000, and Buchanan, \$120,000. Estimates for these two schools were sent to the Congress by the Bureau of the Budget at the request of this committee. This committee wants to build schoolrooms, and no items have been denied that carried schoolrooms save an addition that was asked for the Lovejoy School. This is a colored school in a predominantly white neighborhood. The committee held conferences with school and citizen representatives of both races, and it was agreed by all that the addition there should not be carried in this bill; that the entire situation would be studied and a more satisfactory plan devised for the extension of both school systems in that area. The item for land to be added to the Giddings School contemplated the tearing down of both the Lincoln and Giddings Schools, with a total of 20 rooms, and their replacement

with a new building. The buildings, while old, are serviceable and will be for a number of years. The plan would not increase the available classrooms. Accordingly that item was rejected, with the suggestion that in the study of the Lovejoy situation these buildings might be conserved and a platoon school built elsewhere for colored pupils. The bill also carries \$100,000 for a site for a colored junior high school in this general area.

The Washington Times of January 17, 1929, editorial, elsewhere referred to, makes this statement:

The very committee of which Mr. SIMMONS is a valuable and prominent member readily accepts the dictates of the Bureau [of the Budget] even when it knows beyond question that the bureau should be overridden.

That statement is not true. The Bureau of the Budget is a branch of the Federal Government. It has fixed and definite duties to perform. It performs them. The Budget Bureau does not dictate to the committee. When the committee feels that the Budget is wrong, the committee overrides its proposals and follows its own judgment. Likewise, the Budget readily cooperates with this committee on this and other bills, as is shown by their acceptance of our request for additional estimates totaling \$1,674,000. The difficulty has been that the District officials, as shown by the hearings, have failed to fully cooperate with the Budget in making up the items of this bill.

The Budget shares the view of this committee that more schoolrooms should be provided and fewer accessories in proportion to the total of the bill. New elementary rooms are needed in the area where the Business High School now is. With the abandonment of that school as contemplated by the erection of a new Business High School, the Budget felt that that building should be devoted to elementary school uses and the classroom condition in that area relieved. They have so provided in the bill. In that decision we concur. If at a later date a better use can be made of the building the provision can be changed. In the meantime we will not be losing on the number of elementary classrooms devoted to classroom work.

Since September 1, 1928, 73 new schoolrooms have been opened with sitting space for 2,100 pupils. Buildings now appropriated for, for which plans are being made or which are in the process of construction, provide for 132 additional rooms and additional sitting of 4,036 pupils. This bill carries the initiation of projects that will provide seating capacity for 3,343 pupils. The increase in school attendance this last year was 1,500. As rapid progress is being made in the building program as is warranted. [Applause.]

Unless there are questions about the bill I will ask unanimous consent to print the report on the bill as a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a report of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The report is as follows:

[H. Rept. No. 2151, 70th Cong., 2d sess.]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1930

Mr. SIMMONS, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following report, to accompany H. R. 16422:

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930:

SCOPE OF THE BILL

The bill embraces all regular annual appropriations chargeable partly to the Treasury of the United States and partly to the revenues of the District of Columbia, including appropriations on account of park areas under the jurisdiction of the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the Zoological Park, and for certain work being performed under the supervision of the Engineer Department of the Army.

APPROPRIATIONS AND ESTIMATES

The estimates of appropriations upon which this bill is based were submitted by the President in the Budget for the fiscal year 1930, and will be found in detail in that document under Chapter XIII, pages 1309 to 1426, inclusive, and in supplemental estimates submitted in House Document No. 515.

There follows a summary of the regular annual appropriations for 1929, the Budget estimates for 1930, including the supplemental estimates, and the amounts proposed in the bill for 1930, separated in several funds so as to indicate in a general way the sources of revenue from which the appropriations will be met. The totals of the permanent annual and indefinite appropriations—amounts for which it is not neces-

sary to carry in the annual appropriation bill—are shown in the table at the end of the report and included in the grand total so as to show the final figures affecting the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia:

Source of revenue	Appropriated, 1929	Budget estimate, 1930	Proposed for 1930	Increase (+) or decrease (—) for 1930 as against 1929	Decrease under Budget estimates
Payable from gasoline-tax fund	\$1,802,900	\$1,600,000	\$1,565,600	—\$237,300	\$34,400
Payable from water revenues	1,531,710	1,495,330	1,495,330	—36,380	-----
Payable from District revenues, derived from taxes on real estate, tangible and intangible personal property, public utilities, banks, etc., and from miscellaneous sources	25,302,698	26,461,792	26,152,220	+\$49,572	309,572
Payable from U. S. Treasury	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	-----	-----
Total, regular annual appropriation	37,637,308	38,557,122	38,213,150	+\$575,842	343,972

The regular annual appropriations under which the District of Columbia government is operating for the fiscal year 1929 total \$37,637,308, which includes \$12,100 contained in the second deficiency act of 1928. The amount recommended for the fiscal year 1930 as contained in the President's Budget (and including the supplemental estimates amounting to \$1,674,000) total \$38,557,122. The amount that has been recommended by the committee in the accompanying bill is \$38,213,150, an increase of \$575,842 over the 1929 appropriations, and a decrease of \$343,972 under the total Budget estimates submitted for the next fiscal year. The following table will show the distribution of these figures between the various divisions and services of the municipal government. An explanation of the committee's action in each instance appears under the appropriate heading in this report, and an itemized tabulation of the figures appears at the end of the report:

	Appropriations for 1929 (including deficiency amounts contained in the second deficiency act of 1928)	Budget estimates for 1930	Recommendations for 1930	Increase (+) or decrease (—) for 1930 as compared with 1929 appropriations	Increase (+) or decrease (—) recommended in the bill as compared with the Budget estimates
Salaries (including \$3,800 in second deficiency act, 1928, and \$240,000 in supplemental estimates for 1930)	\$2,166,865	\$2,609,701	\$2,615,679	+\$448,814	+\$5,978
Contingent and miscellaneous	223,700	275,916	274,701	+51,001	—1,215
Street and road improvement and repair, and bridges (including \$160,000 in supplemental estimates for 1930)	4,078,460	3,782,400	3,745,500	—332,960	—36,900
Sewers	1,526,000	1,451,000	1,476,000	—50,000	+25,000
Collection and disposal of refuse	1,576,740	1,613,900	1,613,900	+37,160	-----
Public playgrounds	190,610	198,060	198,060	+7,450	-----
Electrical department	1,140,180	1,145,055	1,140,430	+250	—4,625
Public schools (including \$494,000 contained in supplemental estimates for 1930)	12,150,530	12,087,580	11,846,000	—304,530	—241,580
Metropolitan police	3,141,545	3,129,190	3,083,950	—57,595	—45,240
Fire department	2,130,015	2,209,140	2,171,790	+41,775	—37,350
Health department	309,455	425,590	427,590	+28,135	+2,000
Courts and prisons	790,693	846,380	842,340	+51,647	—4,040
Public welfare (including \$150,000 contained in supplemental estimates for 1930)	4,322,020	4,529,580	4,486,580	+164,560	—43,000
Miscellaneous	230,400	232,900	232,900	+2,500	-----
Public buildings and public parks	1,006,335	1,102,400	1,139,400	+133,065	+37,000
National Capital Park and Planning Commission (including \$400,000 supplemental estimate for 1930)	850,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+150,000	-----
National Zoological Park (including \$220,000 supplemental estimate for 1930)	182,050	423,000	423,000	+240,950	-----
Water service	1,531,710	1,495,330	1,495,330	—36,380	-----
Total regular annual estimates	37,637,308	38,557,122	38,213,150	+\$575,842	—343,972

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES

The original estimates submitted to the committee for its consideration amounted to \$36,883,122, which represented a reduction of \$754,186 under the current appropriations. The estimates as they first appeared for examination were lacking in many important items of a forward-looking character for improvement and development purposes. Investigation by the committee showed that, exclusive of a reserve cash working balance of \$4,000,000 and a reserve of \$1,000,000 to offset items under new law and possible deficiencies in current or prior year appropriations, there would still be a net cash surplus of revenues to the credit of the District of Columbia approximating \$5,000,000. The commissioners, upon invitation by the Bureau of the Budget, had submitted to the bureau after the Budget of \$36,883,122 had been approved, supplementary estimates which were not approved because of the type of a number of the items submitted, among them being provision for additional positions and salary increases. After this refusal, the Bureau of the Budget suggested that an alternative supplementary list be submitted, which was to include items more in the nature of permanent public improvements in the District. This the District Commissioners failed to do. The subcommittee, at the hearings, did not get any justification for the lack of planning in this respect. Having in mind the large idle cash surplus to the credit of the District of Columbia, and believing that the taxpayers of the District were entitled at least to the expenditure of a portion of this fund upon necessary projects from which they would derive a deserved civic benefit, the committee, after indicating the nature of improvements which it would consider, obtained from the District officials an estimate of primary items of importance totaling \$4,979,700, paralleled by a secondary group amounting to \$1,630,000, making a total of \$6,609,700. The committee then cooperated with the Bureau of the Budget, and as a sequence to such action there was submitted to Congress a supplementary list of estimates (H. Doc. No. 515) covering important public improvements amounting to \$1,674,000.

These supplemental estimates covered amounts for the library service, concentration of the highways department shops, repairs to Anacostia Bridge, school sites and buildings, Gallinger Hospital nurses' home, public parks, and a building at the National Zoological Park. The committee has recommended all of these items which makes the total of the bill (as heretofore stated) \$575,442 over the current appropriations. Two additional projects, a municipal center (estimated at \$2,400,000) and a new police court building (estimated at \$300,000), were also given serious consideration. Action thereon has not been taken at this time due to lack of legislation for the civic center, and the opinion that a project of the magnitude of the police court building quite naturally is linked to the plans for a new civic center. Proposed legislation, recently introduced in the House of Representatives, is pending at the present time, and it is anticipated and hoped that action will be taken during this Congress, both of authorization and appropriation for this project.

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

The committee has recommended the Federal contribution of \$9,000,000, which amount has been carried for the past several years. No increase in the current tax rate of \$1.70 is made necessary by the total of the appropriations recommended in the accompanying bill. There has been recommended in the bill a provision continuing for the fiscal year 1930 the same tax rate on real estate and tangible personal property as has been maintained during the current year. The report made recently by the United States Bureau of Efficiency, at the request of the Committee on Appropriations, upon the fiscal relations of the District of Columbia in the opinion of the committee clearly discloses, first, that the contribution of the Federal Government meets fairly and generously all obligations toward the District government by the United States, and, secondly, it shows that when compared with other cities of similar size the District is in a very advantageous situation as to its tax burden and general fiscal condition. The committee finds no reason for changing the method of the Federal contribution, in increasing the amount, or decreasing the District's tax rate. Rather, as has been indicated by the committee's action in its recommendations in this bill, it feels that the District should very properly go ahead with a program of municipal betterments.

SALARIES OF EMPLOYEES

Last year, when the committee had the estimates for the District of Columbia under consideration, it went particularly into the question of the salaries of employees of the District of Columbia, under the classification act of 1923, operative at that time. The salary rates of teachers, firemen, or policemen were not included in the study, as these were and are all covered by legislation apart from the act mentioned. A comparison was made of the average number of employees, the average salary rates, and the total salary obligations for all employees in the District of Columbia, listed under the different Federal establishments, including the District of Columbia, for the years 1927, 1928, and 1929. With the exception of employees under public buildings and public parks of the National Capital—which service was hardly comparable, as most of those employees are grouped

under the custodial grades—the average salary for the employees of the District of Columbia was the lowest of that for the 33 departments and bureaus listed. The committee then ascertained the total amount that would be necessary to bring the salaries of the District employees up to the average salary rates of the grades specified in the then applicable classification act of 1923.

The amount having been estimated at \$340,750, the committee at that time determined to appropriate this amount of money over a 2-year period, distributing it under the respective bureaus and divisions of the local government. A sufficient amount of money was included in the bill and appropriated last year over the Budget estimate, and there was actually expended or allocated during the current fiscal year, prior to the enactment of the Welch Pay Act, \$175,641. The committee's action, of course, in planning this 2-year program of salary increases, was not predicated upon the passage and application of the pay rates contained in the Welch Pay Act. When this law became operative the effect of its provisions, so far as the salaries of the employees of the District of Columbia were concerned, was to add an additional net amount of \$557,802 to the pay roll of the District government over and above the original \$175,641. The total of these two amounts, therefore, \$733,443, represents what actually has been obligated and allocated for salary increases during the current year, and the salary amounts covered in this bill for the next fiscal year maintain this schedule. When the District Commissioners submitted their supplemental estimates to both the Bureau of the Budget and to the committee this year, they included an item of \$165,000, the purpose of which was to finish the second part of the 2-year salary-increase program which the committee had embarked upon last year. The Bureau of the Budget eliminated this estimate in view of the subsequent effect of the Welch Pay Act, and the committee in reporting out this bill has sustained that action. From data, testimony, and tables contained in the hearings this year (pp. 51-62) it will be observed that, in comparison with the Federal departments, the average salary rates of the District government employees are most favorable.

RETIREMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PERSONNEL

Officers and employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia are eligible to the retirement provisions of the act of May 22, 1920, as amended, with the exception of school-teachers and others specially excepted from the provisions of the act. The District personnel contributes to the retirement fund by salary deductions the same as Federal personnel. Until the fiscal year 1929 no appropriation had been made by the Federal Government toward financing the accrued liability of the Government in the retirement fund, which accrued liability is estimated at approximately \$400,000,000. For the fiscal years 1929 and 1930 Congress has appropriated approximately \$20,000,000 each year toward financing the accrued liability of the Government. Included in this stated accrued liability of the Federal Government is the portion of the liability which was created by the participation of District of Columbia employees.

In order that the financing of that portion of the accrued liability which is properly chargeable to District of Columbia personnel may be borne by the District of Columbia instead of by the United States, the committee has recommended a separate section in the bill transferring from District revenues the sum of \$300,000, composed of \$150,000 each for the fiscal years 1929 and 1930, to the credit of the United States. For the next fiscal year and thereafter so long as it may be necessary, it is anticipated that a regular item for this purpose will be budgeted and carried annually to meet the District's share of the accrued liability. The sum of \$150,000 for each of these years is based upon as accurate an estimate as it is now possible to make of the portion that should be borne by the District. As better data become available in future years the annual amount can be readjusted to meet the situation of the accrued liability then existing or to adjust any underestimate or overestimate of the District's share year by year.

ALLOWANCES TO EMPLOYEES FOR QUARTERS, MAINTENANCE, ETC.

At the various institutions of the District of Columbia for many years in the past it has been the practice and custom to allow quarters, maintenance, etc., for employees who are required to live at the institutions. The necessity for a large number of persons to live at the institutions is very obvious. The classification act of 1923 provides that in fixing salaries these maintenance allowances shall be taken into consideration. The rates of allowances and values in effect have been criticized by the Comptroller General as being too low in many cases. In order that these rates may be reviewed by the Personnel Classification Board, the central agency for allocating positions, and determination by them of the adjusted scale of allowances, the committee recommends a paragraph under the Board of Public Welfare continuing the present scale of allowances in effect pending a review and determination of the rates by the board. The institutions involved include the workhouse, reformatory, jail, hospitals, homes, and the various correctional institutions, and a proper and detailed study of the entire field will enable the board to evaluate the allowances in relation to the entire salary question.

CARE OF DISTRICT BUILDING

In the estimates for the care of the District Building, which item provides for the necessary expenses of maintenance and operation, including repairs, fuel, light, and power, there was contemplated the elimination of one employee at \$1,428. This employee was one of five engineers, and it appeared his services were quite necessary. The committee, therefore, increased the appropriation to the extent necessary to include this position.

LICENSE BUREAU

Under the license bureau the committee has inserted the following proviso:

"Provided, That hereafter the superintendent of licenses of the District of Columbia shall not issue a registration certificate or identification tags for any motor vehicle upon which any personal taxes are due and unpaid to the said District.

In testimony submitted to the committee it was stated that a practice existed in the District where some of the inhabitants give a fictitious street address when applying for their registration certificate or identification tags for their automobiles, and this practice naturally obviates the collection later of personal taxes upon the vehicle. By the adoption of the above proviso, this subterfuge will be stopped and it has been estimated that approximately \$70,000 additional in personal-property taxes will come into the District treasury.

OFFICE OF THE CORPORATION COUNSEL

The committee has increased the Budget estimate for the office of the corporation counsel by adding \$1,500 to cover the salary of a messenger. At the present time there is no such employee in this office, and it was stated that such services are much needed.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT

Including a supplemental estimate of \$205,000, the amount recommended for the highways department for the next fiscal year is \$420,690, which is the Budget estimate, and an increase over the current year of \$222,840. The purpose of the supplemental estimate of \$205,000 is to provide for the removal of the highways department shops, etc., to the Bryant Street pumping station, and in this connection, to make certain other desirable economical arrangements for servicing, repairing, and housing municipal automobiles. For many years the store yards and shops of the highways department have been located on United States territory in the center parking of Canal Street, between Second Street west and South Capitol Street. This property was transferred to the United States Botanic Garden under the act of May 11, 1922. The Botanic Garden development requires the early removal of the highways department shops to another location. It is proposed to consolidate the shops of the highways department with those of the water department at the Bryant Street pumping station. In order to accomplish this purpose, provide for the repairs of highways department automobiles at the District automobile repair shop across the street from the Bryant Street pumping station, and provide housing for these automobiles, it will be necessary to provide additional construction as follows:

Addition to District automobile repair shop	\$40,000
New garage	135,000
Shop construction, including asphalt and cement laboratory, and removal of equipment from old to new location	30,000
Total	205,000

The additional construction will be on land already owned by the Government. It is contemplated also that the garage and shops of the trees and parking department, in buildings and on the grounds of the Gallinger Municipal Hospital, shall be moved to the Bryant Street pumping station.

MUNICIPAL ARCHITECT'S OFFICE

The committee by its own action has increased the Budget estimate for the municipal architect's office by \$3,800, to provide for a manager of the District repair shop. At present the shop has no real executive head and it is believed that an employee with such ability to direct the large amount of repair work done under the District government will aid materially in increasing the efficiency of this service.

FREE PUBLIC LIBRARY

The total recommended for the Free Public Library and its branches is \$390,940, which includes a supplemental estimate of \$35,000. This is an increase for 1930 over 1929 of \$58,005. The supplemental estimate proposes the acquisition of a site, to be approved by the Commissioners of the District and the board of library trustees, for a building for a northeastern branch library. The board of library trustees has considered that a branch library in the northeastern section of the city is most urgently needed, directing attention to the fact that in this section there is 1 junior high school, 18 graded schools, 3 parochial schools, the Gallaudet College, as well as many churches, and other organizations and institutions. The proposed library will serve a large commercial and residential area, and it is expected that when completed this branch library will benefit about 100,000 people.

RECORDER OF DEEDS

At the present time all expenditures under the office of the recorder of deeds are accountable only to the General Accounting Office and are not reviewed by the auditor of the District of Columbia government. This situation has existed for a number of years and at times has created conditions that do not lend themselves to the proper efficiency of this office. The committee is of the opinion that the expenditures of this office should, like all other units under the District government, receive the prior approval of the Commissioners of the District. Accordingly, a proviso has been inserted in the bill under the office of the recorder to bring about such an administrative review before audit by the General Accounting Office.

EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

The committee has increased the Budget estimate for personal services and miscellaneous and contingent expenses for maintaining a public employment service for the District by replacing one employee at \$1,650, which had been eliminated. The committee is of the opinion that this service is rendering a distinct help in the District of Columbia in placing jobless individuals in positions, and that reducing the staff by one employee would work a real hardship, especially in view of the fact that the total pay roll represents only 8 positions, 2 Federal and 6 municipal.

STREET AND ROAD IMPROVEMENT AND REPAIR

The total recommended for the various items for street and road improvement and repair in the District of Columbia is \$3,745,500, which includes a supplemental estimate of \$120,000. These figures represent a reduction of \$332,960 under the current year and \$36,900 under the Budget estimate. The following table sets forth at a glance the different funds appropriated for under the general amount shown above:

Street and road improvement and repair

Object	Appropriations for 1929	Estimates for 1930	Amount recommended in the bill for 1930	Increase (+) or decrease (-), bill compared with 1929 appropriations	Increase (+) or decrease (-), bill compared with 1930 Budget estimates
Assessment and permit work, sidewalks, curbs, and alleys.....	300,000	300,000	300,000	-----	-----
Paving roadways under permit system.....	40,000	30,000	30,000	-10,000	-----
Gasoline tax, road and street fund.....	1,802,900	1,600,000	1,565,600	-237,300	-34,400
Grading.....	50,000	-----	-----	-50,000	-----
Condemnation—streets, roads, alleys, and purchase or condemnation of small parks.....	5,000	5,000	5,000	-----	-----
Streets, avenues, roads, or highways: Opening, widening, or extension of.....	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)	-----	-----
Streets, avenues, and alleys, repairs.....	1,475,000	1,475,000	1,475,000	-----	-----
Sidewalks and curbs around, public reservations, etc.....	10,000	15,000	15,000	+5,000	-----
Bridges, construction and repair (including \$120,000 contained in a supplemental estimate).....	77,060	207,500	207,500	+130,440	-----
Reconstruction and replacement of bridges.....	178,000	-----	-----	-178,000	-----
Trees and parkings.....	112,500	115,000	112,500	-----	-2,500
Public convenience stations.....	28,000	34,900	34,900	+6,900	-----
Total street and road improvement and repair.....	4,078,460	3,782,400	3,745,500	-332,960	-36,900

¹ Indefinite.

For paving, repaving, and grading, under the gasoline-tax road and street fund, the committee has eliminated two improvements which were contained in the estimates when they were examined. These items are the paving of Western Avenue NW., from Forty-first Street to Chevy Chase Circle, \$21,000; and the paving of Admiral Barney Circle SE., \$31,000. The committee, as is its custom, made the usual automobile trip over all street improvements contemplated in this bill and were unanimously of the opinion that from the present fair condition of these two projects they could very properly be postponed for a while.

The supplemental estimate of \$120,000 proposes the reconstruction of the floor system and handrail of the Anacostia River Bridge. This bridge was built in 1908 and consists of six steel arch spans and a draw span. The roadway, 35 feet wide with two 6.5-foot sidewalks, carries two street-car tracks. The asphalt surface of the floor has rolled so that in places the curb height is reduced to 1 inch. This is a very inadequate protection to vehicular traffic, and the railing is not of sufficient strength safely to withstand the impact of modern traffic.

The entire floor system is in need of replacement at a lower level to provide an increased height of curb.

SEWERS

The Budget estimate of \$1,451,000 for the different activities of the sewer service in the District has been increased by the committee \$25,000 to provide for continuing the construction of the Stickfoot Branch storm water sewer, a project that is, according to testimony submitted by interested citizens in that locality, quite desirable. The other funds remain approximately the same and propose the same amount of work for next year as is called for by the present program. The item for assessment and permit work shows an apparent reduction of \$70,000, but this is offset by making certain unexpended balances of the current appropriation available for 1930.

The total amount recommended for the public schools, their maintenance, personal services, and buildings and grounds for the next fiscal year is \$11,846,000, which includes a supplemental estimate of \$494,000 for additional schools and school sites. The recommendations represent a reduction of \$304,530 under the current year and \$241,580 under the Budget estimates. This reduction, however, is merely a postponement to a future date of several school projects until certain elements incident to their construction are worked out.

Personal services of administrative and advisory officers: The committee has added \$5,000 over the Budget estimate for the appointment of what is to be known as a business manager for the school department. During the hearings last year it was developed that there was lacking in the system an administrative business manager to supervise only the business administration and expenditures. A joint hearing was had between the House Subcommittee on Appropriations and the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations handling District appropriations, with school officials and the school board, at that time. They were asked to study the suggestion of the creation of such a position and to report back this year. At the conclusion of the hearings this year it was decided to go ahead with the appointment of such a manager, to be chosen by the District Commissioners, the school board, and the superintendent of schools, the manager to be preferably one with an engineer's qualifications. By following out this proposal, it will relieve the superintendent of many matters of a business nature which he has to determine at the present time and concentrate under one proper supervision the manifold construction, engineering, and mechanical questions which naturally arise in carrying out the school-expansion program.

Teachers: The estimates examined by the committee proposed 33 new teacher positions, as follows: Eight, class 1A, at \$1,400; 4, class 2A, at \$1,800; 8, class 2C, at \$2,200; and 13, class 3A, at \$2,200. Of the number of teachers requested (33) the committee has recommended in the accompanying bill 15, or a net reduction of 18. Those included in the bill are: One, class 1A, at \$1,400; 4, class 2A, at \$1,800; 3, class 2C, at \$2,200; and 7, class 3A, at \$2,200. Those eliminated are 7, class 1A, at \$1,400; 5, class 2C, at \$2,200; and 6, class 3A, at \$2,200. Those additional teachers recommended by the committee represent positions necessary in the establishment of new classes. Those additional teachers requested that were eliminated by the committee represented teachers that were not for new classes but in addition to their regular staff presumably because of oversized classes. The committee in making the reduction has followed the same policy that it adopted last year in following the recommendations contained in the school report of the United States Bureau of Efficiency, at which time it was quite apparent that there were ample teachers to take care of operating classroom needs. The situation presented to the committee this year indicates nothing to change this policy, except the appointment of teachers to new classrooms.

Public works: The total amount for public works (which includes both the building of new schools, additions to existing schools, and the purchase of new sites for proposed future schools) which is recommended for the school program for the next fiscal year is \$2,242,000. This amount includes a supplemental estimate of \$494,000.

For the erection of school additions and building new schools there will be available for 1930 a total of \$1,835,000. This amount covers 10 actual projects, as follows:

Project	School	Amount
8-room addition and combination gymnasium and assembly hall.	Morgan School.....	(¹)
Combination gymnasium and assembly hall.	John Eaton School.....	\$50,000
Junior high school building (limit of cost, \$500,000).	Reno section.....	200,000
Completing E. A. Paul Junior High School.	Brightwood.....	250,000
Completing construction of elementary school building and combination gymnasium and assembly hall.	Nineteenth and Columbia Road NW.	225,000
Junior high school building (limit of cost, \$500,000).	Vicinity of Kingsman School.	200,000
Colored Health School.....	Undetermined.....	150,000
New Business High School (limit of cost, \$1,500,000).	Site adjoining Macfarland Junior High School.	300,000
Addition to Park View School.	Park View.....	265,000
4-room addition, including combination gymnasium and assembly hall.	Buchanan School.....	120,000
		1,835,000

¹ Unexpended balance.

School sites: For the purchase of sites for proposed new schools there is included in the bill \$407,000, which contemplates the purchase of land, or portions of land, for eight new projects, the exact location of which is as yet undetermined.

POLICE DEPARTMENT

The bill carries a total amount for the police department of the District of Columbia of \$3,083,950, which is a decrease of \$57,595 under the amount for this year and a net reduction of \$45,240 under the estimates contained in the Budget. The figures first presented to the committee included an amount of \$36,300, involving the addition of 13 new privates at \$1,800, 3 sergeants at \$2,400, 1 lieutenant at \$2,700, and 1 captain at \$3,000. The committee has disallowed all of these 18 additional men for the force. It based its action upon the number of men now on the force, believing it to be amply sufficient properly and efficiently to patrol the city. The District force, under its present number, compares most favorably with other metropolitan cities. A report, made recently by the United States Bureau of Efficiency, states:

"Washington has a greater number of policemen per capita, regardless of the fact that it has no large foreign-born population and that it is neither an industrial center nor a seaport, than the cities of Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Cleveland, St. Louis, Baltimore, Pittsburgh, Buffalo, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Cincinnati, Kansas City, Mo., Indianapolis, and Toledo. Its per capita is only exceeded by New York City, Boston, and Newark."

This report does not take into consideration an additional force of 71 park police maintained under the Superintendent of Public Buildings and Grounds, the police force at the Capitol, House, and Senate Office Buildings, and the numerous guards stationed at all Federal buildings. If this additional police protection were taken into consideration no city in the United States could compare with the number of policemen per capita. The committee has also inserted a provision reducing the amount for extra compensation to members of the force who may be mounted on horses from \$450 to \$360 per annum; those mounted on bicycles from \$70 to \$50 per annum; and extra compensation for motor vehicles from \$480 to \$312, being of the opinion that the amount authorized under current law to be excessive. In reducing the estimate by 18 positions a corresponding reduction of \$1,350 was made in the fund for uniforms.

A reduction of \$4,000 in the estimate for the house of detention has also been made because in the original estimate for this service an allocation of \$15,000 was made for rental, whereas recently the house of detention has been able to obtain quarters at a rate for the next fiscal year totaling \$11,000 per annum.

Last year there was appropriated a sum of \$52,000 for the erection of a building to be known as the fifteenth police precinct station house. No construction has as yet started on the proposed station, and in the conduct of the hearings this year officials of the police department failed to impress the committee with the immediate need for such a station house. Accordingly the committee has made available \$2,000 of the appropriation for this purpose for the acquisition of additional land for the final site for this house when conditions warrant its erection and reappropriated and transferred the remaining \$50,000 to another item in the bill.

FIRE DEPARTMENT

The committee has reduced the estimate presented to it for the fire department \$41,775 under the current year and \$37,350 under the estimate contained in the Budget, making a total amount available for the department for next year of \$2,171,790. This reduction includes the elimination of 18 new firemen for six months, totaling \$17,000; some new fire gear amounting to \$21,000; and the uniform appropriation by \$1,350. The committee substantiates its action as follows: Last year when the bill was before the committee for its consideration an amount was recommended for a site and for the erection and furnishing of a building for an engine company to be located in the vicinity of Sixteenth Street and Colorado Avenue NW. Injunction proceedings precluded the District officials from proceeding with this program, and the matter is still in the courts. Eighteen additional men and the requisite fire gear were recommended in the amounts carried in the bill for this new fire house. Despite the fact that there has been no fire house at which to station these men, they were appointed shortly after the money became available. In the estimates originally submitted to the committee, as has been stated, there were 18 new men included for manning a proposed fire house at Connecticut and Nebraska Avenues, which is recommended in the bill. The committee has eliminated these new positions and the apparatus and expects the department to use at this latter station the personnel and apparatus granted last year for the station the construction of which is held up temporarily pending the outcome of litigation.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

The bill carries a total amount of \$427,590 for the health department of the District, which is an increase of \$28,135 over the current year. All of this increase is absorbed by salary readjustments under the Welch Pay Act. The committee has increased the appropriation for maintaining a child hygiene service by adding \$2,000 to the Budget estimate, making the amount available for this purpose for 1930

\$54,000. In reality this is an increase of \$4,000 over the current year. The department contemplates the establishment of an additional hygiene station. The amount in the estimate did not appear sufficient, so the committee of its own volition raised the amount as indicated.

COURTS AND PRISONS

For the District courts, their expenses, and the support of convicts of the District of Columbia a total of \$842,340 has been recommended for the year 1930. This amount reflects an increase of \$51,647 over the current year and a decrease of \$4,040 under the Budget estimates.

Juvenile court: The bill carries \$65,740 for the activities of the juvenile court and its probation officers. The committee eliminated as unnecessary a proposed additional financial clerk at \$1,620 per annum.

Police court: The committee reduced the amount for the police court by \$2,420, making the total appropriation for 1930 \$142,620. The committee's action in making the reduction referred to eliminated one night court clerk at \$1,920, whose services were no longer necessary by reason of the committee's action last year in closing the night traffic court, and by reducing the general maintenance fund by \$500. The committee was informed last year that by closing the night traffic court it would cause a reduction both in the amount needed for fuel and for gas, electric light, and power. In the estimated allocations under this fund for 1930 the amounts remained practically the same.

Municipal court: The Budget estimate of \$83,270 has been recommended for the municipal court, an increase over this year of \$8,734. This increase includes an additional bookkeeper at \$1,800, the balance being absorbed by Welch Pay Act increases.

Supreme Court of the District of Columbia: Including a supplemental estimate of \$10,000, covering the salary of an additional judge authorized by the act of December 20, 1928, the amount estimated in the Budget for the conduct of the Supreme Court of the District was \$292,520. No additional employees are recommended over this year, the differentiation in amount between 1929 and 1930 being covered by salary increases under the Welch Act.

PUBLIC WELFARE

Including a supplemental estimate of \$150,000 for a nurses' home at Gallinger Municipal Hospital under an estimated cost not to exceed \$325,000, the estimates submitted for the various public-welfare activities total \$4,529,580. The committee has recommended \$4,486,580, which is an increase of \$164,560 over 1929 and an apparent decrease under the Budget of \$43,000. Actually, however, the committee increased the Budget amount by making available \$50,000 of an unexpended appropriation for the purposes of the construction of permanent buildings at the reformatory, and thus releasing this amount from the set-up. This increase of \$7,000 is covered by raising the item for a home for the superintendent at the Home for the Feeble-Minded from \$15,000 to \$20,000, and by increasing the appropriation for the Temporary Home for Union Ex-Soldiers and Sailors, \$2,000, to cover the salary of a night watchman and repairs.

The committee has increased the amount to be available from the various funds at the District Reformatory, to act as a revolving fund, and known as the working capital fund, from \$25,000 to \$50,000. This fund was created last year upon recommendation by the Bureau of Efficiency, the purpose being to provide certain small self-paying industries at this institution to keep the men occupied and provide some means of remuneration for their labor. The initial success of this idea has induced the committee to increase the fund for the purpose of adding several other industries at the institution.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND PARKS

The committee has recommended for public buildings and parks for the District a total of \$1,139,400, an increase of \$123,065 over the current year and an increase of \$37,000 over the Budget estimates. The item for salaries under public parks reflects a Budget increase of \$49,540 over 1929. This increase covers \$44,280 for increases under the Welch Act, and \$5,260 for an increase of five laborers at the minimum rate. For salaries of the park police the bill carries \$152,000 for 151 men, an increase of \$2,000 and 1 officer for next year over 1929. Including a supplemental estimate of \$40,000, and an increase by the committee over the Budget estimate of \$37,000, the appropriation for general expenses for public parks is \$570,000. The supplemental estimate is an initial amount for beginning the construction of a sidewalk and protective railing along the sea wall of East Potomac Park. At the present time a sidewalk and an iron railing now encircle the sea wall at Hains Point. The purpose of this estimate is to continue the walk and railing a considerable distance on both the Washington Channel and Potomac River sides of East Potomac Park. The \$32,000 added by the committee over the Budget estimate covers an item for the purchase of road metal for the parkway between Massachusetts Avenue and the Zoo, which was eliminated from the estimates by the committee last year because the material would not be used at that time. An additional \$5,000 was added by the committee for temporary labor.

NATIONAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

The original estimate submitted to the committee for the National Park and Planning Commission for 1930 for the purchase of park areas

was \$600,000, a reduction under the current year of \$250,000. A supplemental estimate of \$400,000 was received later for inclusion in the amount recommended for 1930, bringing the total up to \$1,000,000. This supplemental estimate is to expedite the purchase by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission of lands for the proper extension of the park and playground system.

NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

Including a supplemental estimate of \$220,000, the amount recommended for 1930 is \$423,000, an increase over the current year of \$240,950. The supplemental estimate is to provide the necessary housing facilities for the proper exhibition of collections of reptiles, amphibians, insects, and other invertebrates. At present reptiles and amphibians must be kept in the lion house under conditions unsuitable for their care and exhibition. This amount will provide for the most pressing need at the Zoo.

WATER SERVICE

Washington Aqueduct: The amount recommended has been increased from \$425,000 for 1929 to \$441,000 for 1930. The increase of \$16,000 is required to cover increases of salaries due to the Welch Act, amounting to \$8,400, and to the increased amount of water which will be consumed in 1930, the treatment and pumping of which will cost \$7,600 additional.

Salaries and maintenance: The amounts carried in the bill for salaries is \$154,800, an increase of \$10,440 due to the Welch Act, and for maintenance \$365,000, an increase of \$30,000, \$25,000 of which is due to increased per diem wages under the wage scale of August 6, 1928, and \$5,000 general increase to provide for unforeseen emergencies.

The amounts for extension of distribution systems, \$250,000; installing water meters, \$30,000; installing fire and public hydrants, \$50,000; and replacement of old mains, \$50,000; all remain the same as the current year.

For the extension of water mains in different sections of the city there are five projects contemplated, at a total cost of \$154,532.

LIMITATIONS AND PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Limitations with respect to expenditures or legislative provisions, not heretofore enacted, are recommended as follows:

On page 2:

"* * * and the tax rate in effect in the fiscal year 1929 on real estate and tangible personal property subject to taxation in the District of Columbia shall be continued for the fiscal year 1930 * * *."

On page 4:

"Provided, That hereafter the superintendent of licenses of the District of Columbia shall not issue a registration certificate or identification tags for any motor vehicle upon which any personal taxes are due and unpaid to the said District."

On page 11:

"Provided, That no part of the appropriations contained in this act for personal services and other expenses of the office of the recorder of deeds shall be expended without the prior approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or under such regulations as the commissioners shall approve, and all expenditures from such appropriations shall be made and accounted for in the manner provided by law for the expenditure of other appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia."

On page 16:

"Provided, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized, when in their judgment such action be deemed in the public interest, to contract for stenographic reporting services under available appropriations contained in this act."

On page 37:

"Provided, That beginning July 1, 1931, and thereafter, section 3 of the act of the Legislative Assembly of the District of Columbia, approved June 23, 1873, entitled 'An act to establish a normal school for the city of Washington' (sec. 42, ch. 57, of the Compiled Statutes in force in the District of Columbia), shall apply only to those graduates of the normal schools of the District of Columbia who shall at the time of their graduation rank within the first 25 per cent of their respective classes, arranged in order of their ratings received for their entire normal-school course."

On page 47, in connection with the appropriation for a new business high school:

"Provided, That upon completion of such building, the building now occupied by the Business High School shall be used as an elementary school for colored pupils."

On page 51, in connection with the appropriation for salaries of police:

"Provided, That hereafter no more than \$360 per annum shall be paid as extra compensation to members of said force who may be mounted on horses, furnished and maintained by themselves; no more than \$50 per annum as extra compensation to members mounted on bicycles; and no more than \$312 per annum to members who may be called upon to use motor vehicles, furnished and maintained by themselves."

On page 60, in connection with the health department:

"Provided, That inspectors of dairy farms may receive an allowance for furnishing privately owned motor vehicles in the performance of official duties at the rate of not to exceed \$480 per annum for each inspector."

On page 60:

"The health officer of the District of Columbia is hereby authorized and directed to transfer all the marriage records in the health department, within 15 days after the passage of this act, to the clerk of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, who shall thereafter have the same control and custody of such records as he has now of the marriage records in the said clerk's office."

On page 67:

"The practice of allowing quarters, heat, light, household equipment, subsistence, and laundry service to officers and employees of the government of the District of Columbia who are required to live at the several institutions of such District may be continued at the rates or values in effect on the date of the enactment of this act pending review and determination of rates or values by the Personnel Classification Board as provided by law."

On page 76, in connection with the appropriation for additional land at the District Training School:

"If the land proposed to be acquired can not be purchased at a satisfactory price the Attorney General of the United States, at the request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, shall institute condemnation proceedings to acquire such land, the title of said land to be taken directly to and in the name of the United States, but the land so acquired shall be held under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as agents of the United States, and the expenses of procuring evidence of title or of condemnation, or both, shall be paid out of the appropriation herein made for the purchase of said land."

On page 96:

"Sec. 7. Of the appropriations for the fiscal years 1929 and 1930, respectively, toward financing the liability of the United States created by the act entitled 'An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes,' approved May 22, 1920, and acts amendatory thereof, the sum of \$150,000 for each of such fiscal years shall be charged to the revenues of the District of Columbia and such sums shall be transferred from the revenues of the District to the credit of the United States on account of the retirement of District of Columbia personnel under such acts."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1930

Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for the fiscal year 1929, the Budget estimates for the fiscal year 1930, the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1930 [NOTE.—Appropriations for 1929 include amounts in regular annual, deficiency, and other acts]

Object	Appropriations for 1929	Estimates for 1930	Amount recommended in the bill for 1930	Increase (+) or decrease (—), bill compared with 1929 appropriations	Increase (+) or decrease (—), bill compared with 1930 Budget estimates
SALARIES					
Executive offices, commissioners, clerks, etc.	\$247,380.00	\$272,420.00	\$272,920.00	+\$25,540.00	+\$500.00
District Building:					
Care of	63,070.00	68,626.00	70,054.00	+6,984.00	+1,428.00
Fuel, etc.	34,500.00	37,500.00	37,500.00	+3,000.00	
Assessor's office	189,770.00	207,510.00	207,510.00	+17,740.00	
License bureau	19,320.00	19,820.00	19,820.00	+500.00	
Collector's office	43,550.00	46,450.00	46,450.00	+2,900.00	
Auditor's office (including \$3,800 in the second deficiency act, 1928)	108,010.00	118,640.00	118,640.00	+10,630.00	
Corporation counsel's office	58,340.00	65,120.00	66,620.00	+8,280.00	+1,500.00
Coroner's office:					
Salaries	9,190.00	10,040.00	10,040.00	+850.00	
Contingent expenses	10,000.00	4,775.00	4,775.00	—5,225.00	
Weights, measures, etc., office of:					
Salaries	42,545.00	47,080.00	47,080.00	+4,535.00	
Contingent expenses	45,975.00	11,050.00	11,050.00	—34,925.00	

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1930—continued

Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for the fiscal year 1929, the Budget estimates for the fiscal year 1930, the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1930—Continued

Object	Appropriations for 1929	Estimates for 1930	Amount recommended in the bill for 1930	Increase (+) or decrease (-), bill compared with 1929 appropriations	Increase (+) or decrease (-), bill compared with 1930 Budget estimates
SALARIES—continued					
Engineering department:					
Highways department (including \$205,000 contained in a supplemental estimate)	\$197,850.00	\$420,690.00	\$420,690.00	+\$222,840.00	-----
Sewer department	178,360.00	193,200.00	193,200.00	+14,840.00	-----
Trees and parking department	19,720.00	22,880.00	22,880.00	+3,160.00	-----
Chief clerk, office of	26,040.00	28,000.00	28,000.00	+1,960.00	-----
Central garage	4,890.00	5,240.00	5,240.00	+350.00	-----
Municipal architect's office	53,740.00	59,900.00	63,700.00	+9,960.00	+\$3,800.00
Public Utilities Commission	72,230.00	76,520.00	76,620.00	+4,390.00	+100.00
Incidental expenses	4,200.00	1,700.00	1,700.00	-2,500.00	-----
Board of examiners, steam engineers	450.00	450.00	450.00	-----	-----
Insurance, department of	18,090.00	19,560.00	19,560.00	+1,470.00	-----
Surveyor's office:					
Salaries	79,050.00	84,690.00	84,690.00	+5,640.00	-----
Surveys, permanent highway system, etc.	3,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	-----	-----
Employees' compensation fund	28,000.00	31,000.00	31,000.00	+3,000.00	-----
Compensation to injured employees	-----	63,000.00	63,000.00	+63,000.00	-----
Director of traffic	29,600.00	39,040.00	39,040.00	+9,440.00	-----
Purchase, maintenance, etc., of traffic lights	45,000.00	43,700.00	43,700.00	-1,300.00	-----
Free Public Library, including branches:					
Salaries	240,035.00	265,640.00	265,640.00	+25,605.00	-----
Substitutes, employment of	6,000.00	6,000.00	6,000.00	-----	-----
Sunday opening	3,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	-----	-----
Miscellaneous expenses (including \$35,000 contained in a supplemental estimate)	83,900.00	116,300.00	115,450.00	+31,550.00	-850.00
Register of wills:					
Salaries	67,560.00	73,640.00	73,640.00	+6,080.00	-----
Miscellaneous expenses	10,000.00	11,500.00	11,000.00	+1,000.00	-500.00
Recorder of deeds:					
Salaries	96,000.00	104,020.00	104,020.00	+8,020.00	-----
Miscellaneous expenses	14,500.00	14,000.00	14,000.00	-500.00	-----
Rent	14,000.00	14,000.00	14,000.00	-----	-----
Total, salaries	2,166,865.00	2,609,701.00	2,615,679.00	+448,814.00	+5,978.00
CONTINGENT AND MISCELLANEOUS					
Contingent expenses, general	50,000.00	36,350.00	36,350.00	-13,650.00	-----
Printing annual reports	4,800.00	-----	-----	-4,800.00	-----
Printing and binding	-----	70,000.00	70,000.00	+70,000.00	-----
Motor vehicles, purchase, maintenance, etc.	112,000.00	109,816.00	107,951.00	-4,049.00	-1,865.00
Postage	21,000.00	23,000.00	22,000.00	+1,000.00	-1,000.00
Judicial expenses	4,500.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	-1,500.00	-----
Advertising, general	8,000.00	8,000.00	8,000.00	-----	-----
Advertising notice of taxes in arrears	6,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	+4,000.00	-----
Public employment service	9,650.00	8,000.00	9,650.00	-----	+1,650.00
Historical places, marking tablets	500.00	500.00	500.00	-----	-----
Emergency fund	4,000.00	4,000.00	4,000.00	-----	-----
Refund of erroneous collections, including \$2,000 in the first deficiency act of 1928	3,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	-----	-----
Uniform State laws conference	250.00	250.00	250.00	-----	-----
Total, contingent and miscellaneous	223,700.00	275,916.00	274,701.00	+51,001.00	-1,215.00
STREET AND ROAD IMPROVEMENT AND REPAIR					
Assessment and permit work, sidewalks, curbs, and alleys	300,000.00	300,000.00	300,000.00	-----	-----
Paving roadways under permit system	40,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00	-10,000.00	-----
Gasoline tax, road and street fund	1,802,900.00	1,600,000.00	1,565,600.00	-237,300.00	-34,400.00
Grading	50,000.00	-----	-----	-50,000.00	-----
Condemnation—streets, roads, alleys, and purchase or condemnation of small parks	5,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	-----	-----
Streets, avenues, roads, or highways: Opening, widening, or extension of	(1)	(1)	(1)	-----	-----
Streets, avenues, and alleys, repairs	1,475,000.00	1,475,000.00	1,475,000.00	-----	-----
Sidewalks and curbs around public reservations, etc.	10,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00	+5,000.00	-----
Bridges, construction and repair (including \$120,000 contained in a supplemental estimate)	77,050.00	207,500.00	207,500.00	+130,440.00	-----
Reconstruction and replacement of bridges	178,000.00	-----	-----	-178,000.00	-----
Trees and parkings	112,500.00	115,000.00	112,500.00	-----	-2,500.00
Public convenience stations	28,000.00	34,900.00	34,900.00	+6,900.00	-----
Total street and road improvement and repair	4,078,450.00	3,782,400.00	3,745,500.00	-332,950.00	-36,900.00
SEWERS					
Cleaning, repairing, and operation of sewage-pumping service	255,000.00	250,000.00	250,000.00	-5,000.00	-----
Main and pipe sewers and receiving basins	195,000.00	210,000.00	210,000.00	+15,000.00	-----
Suburban sewers	600,000.00	600,000.00	600,000.00	-----	-----
Assessment and permit work	410,000.00	340,000.00	340,000.00	-70,000.00	-----
Rights of way, purchase, condemnation, etc.	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	-----	-----
Upper Potomac interceptor	50,000.00	50,000.00	50,000.00	-----	-----
Stickfoot branch sewer	-----	25,000.00	25,000.00	+25,000.00	+25,000.00
Upper Anacostia main interceptor	15,000.00	-----	-----	-15,000.00	-----
Total, sewers	1,526,000.00	1,451,000.00	1,476,000.00	-50,000.00	+25,000.00
COLLECTION AND DISPOSAL OF REFUSE					
Street-cleaning division, salaries	126,740.00	138,900.00	138,900.00	+12,160.00	-----
Dust prevention, cleaning, and snow removal	500,000.00	500,000.00	500,000.00	-----	-----
Refuse, disposal of	950,000.00	975,000.00	975,000.00	+25,000.00	-----
Total, collection and disposal of refuse	1,576,740.00	1,613,900.00	1,613,900.00	+37,160.00	-----
PUBLIC PLAYGROUNDS					
Salaries	101,230.00	113,180.00	113,180.00	+11,950.00	-----
Contingent expenses	51,500.00	46,000.00	46,000.00	-5,500.00	-----
Expenses of school playgrounds, summer months	25,000.00	29,000.00	29,000.00	+4,000.00	-----
Maintenance and operation of swimming pools	6,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	-3,000.00	-----
Bathing pools	6,880.00	6,880.00	6,880.00	-----	-----
Total, public playgrounds	190,610.00	198,060.00	198,060.00	+7,450.00	-----
Indefinite.	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1930—continued

Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for the fiscal year 1929, the Budget estimates for the fiscal year 1930, the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1930—Continued

Object	Appropriations for 1929	Estimates for 1930	Amount recommended in the bill for 1930	Increase (+) or decrease (—), bill compared with 1929 appropriations	Increase (+) or decrease (—), bill compared with 1930 Budget estimates
ELECTRICAL DEPARTMENT					
Salaries	\$117,160.00	\$128,680.00	\$128,680.00	+\$11,520.00	
General supplies, repairs, etc.	33,000.00	31,750.00	31,750.00	-1,250.00	
Placing wires underground for fire alarms, patrol boxes, etc.	34,000.00	34,625.00	30,000.00	-4,000.00	-\$4,625.00
Lighting	949,450.00	950,000.00	950,000.00	+550.00	
Equipment, new police precinct	4,570.00			-4,570.00	
Addition to storehouse	2,000.00			-2,000.00	
Total, electrical department	1,140,180.00	1,145,055.00	1,140,430.00	+250.00	-4,625.00
PUBLIC SCHOOLS					
Salaries:					
Officers	633,900.00	651,740.00	656,740.00	+22,840.00	+5,000.00
Clerks and other employees	127,540.00	146,940.00	148,560.00	+21,020.00	+1,620.00
Attendance department	32,800.00	36,900.00	36,900.00	+4,100.00	
Teachers	5,841,920.00	6,000,000.00	5,966,000.00	+124,080.00	-34,000.00
Vacation schools, playgrounds, etc.	33,000.00	33,000.00	33,000.00		
Teachers' retirement fund	380,000.00	400,000.00	400,000.00	+20,000.00	
Night schools:					
Salaries	95,000.00	95,000.00	95,000.00		
Contingent expenses	4,500.00	4,500.00	4,500.00		
Deaf, dumb, and blind:					
Columbia Institution for the Deaf	27,500.00	27,500.00	27,500.00		
Colored deaf-mutes, instruction of	6,500.00	6,500.00	6,500.00		
Blind, instruction of indigent	10,500.00	10,500.00	10,500.00		
Americanization work	11,000.00	12,000.00	12,000.00	+1,000.00	
Community center department	41,000.00	42,000.00	42,000.00	+1,000.00	
Care of buildings and grounds	619,280.00	762,000.00	762,000.00	+142,720.00	
Care of smaller buildings, etc.	7,000.00	6,500.00	6,500.00	-500.00	
Miscellaneous:					
Tubercular pupils, school maintenance	7,000.00	7,000.00	7,000.00		
Transportation of tubercular children	5,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00		
Manual-training apparatus, equipment, etc.	85,000.00	90,000.00	90,000.00	+5,000.00	
Fuel, light, and power	270,000.00	290,000.00	290,000.00	+20,000.00	
Furniture, etc., kindergartens, manual training, etc.	22,000.00	194,500.00	194,500.00	+172,500.00	
Furniture, etc., McKinley Technical High School	350,000.00			-350,000.00	
Contingent expenses, furniture, stationery, etc.	155,000.00	190,000.00	187,800.00	+32,800.00	-2,200.00
Textbooks and supplies	125,000.00	125,000.00	125,000.00		
Kindergarten supplies	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00		
School gardens	3,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00		
Physics, chemistry, and biology departments, apparatus, etc., for	14,000.00	16,000.00	16,000.00	+2,000.00	
Buildings and grounds:					
Repairs, etc.	529,610.00	450,000.00	450,000.00	-79,610.00	
For renovating old McKinley High School	70,500.00			-70,500.00	
Rent of buildings	11,000.00	8,000.00	8,000.00	-3,000.00	
Equipment, grading, etc., playgrounds	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00		
Public works (including \$494,000 contained in a supplemental estimate)	2,612,000.00	2,454,000.00	2,242,000.00	-370,000.00	-212,000.00
Total, public schools	12,150,530.00	12,087,580.00	11,846,000.00	-304,530.00	-241,580.00
METROPOLITAN POLICE					
Salaries	2,840,470.00	2,876,850.00	2,836,960.00	-3,510.00	-39,890.00
Purchase of uniforms	67,075.00	68,400.00	67,050.00	-25.00	-1,350.00
Miscellaneous	211,000.00	145,500.00	145,500.00	-65,500.00	
House of Detention	21,000.00	36,440.00	32,440.00	+11,440.00	-4,000.00
Harbor patrol	2,000.00	2,000.00	2,000.00		
Total, Metropolitan police	3,141,545.00	3,129,190.00	3,083,950.00	-57,595.00	-45,240.00
Policemen and firemen's relief fund (payable from policemen and firemen's relief fund)	650,000.00			-650,000.00	
FIRE DEPARTMENT					
Salaries	1,904,040.00	1,923,440.00	1,905,440.00	+2,400.00	-17,000.00
Uniforms	30,975.00	31,750.00	30,400.00	-575.00	-1,350.00
Miscellaneous	140,500.00	141,000.00	141,000.00	+500.00	
Permanent improvements	54,500.00	112,950.00	93,950.00	+39,450.00	-19,000.00
Total, fire department	2,130,015.00	2,209,140.00	2,171,790.00	+41,775.00	-37,350.00
HEALTH DEPARTMENT					
Salaries	166,430.00	181,690.00	181,690.00	+15,260.00	
Contagious diseases, prevention of	43,000.00	45,000.00	45,000.00	+2,000.00	
Repair of clinics	8,000.00			-8,000.00	
Garfield and Providence Hospitals, isolation wards in	23,000.00	24,000.00	24,000.00	+1,000.00	
Tuberculosis dispensaries	20,000.00	24,200.00	24,200.00	+4,200.00	
Disinfecting service, maintenance of	5,500.00	3,700.00	3,700.00	-1,800.00	
Abatement of nuisances and drainage of lots	3,000.00	2,500.00	2,500.00	-500.00	
Drugs and foods, detection of adulteration of	100.00			-100.00	
Hygiene and sanitation, public schools	67,340.00	74,000.00	74,000.00	+6,660.00	
Free dental clinic	1,000.00			-1,000.00	
Bacteriological laboratory	2,500.00	3,000.00	3,000.00	+500.00	
Dairy-farm inspection	5,000.00			-5,000.00	
Contingent expenses	1,000.00	8,100.00	8,100.00	+7,100.00	
Public crematory, maintenance, etc.	3,000.00	3,900.00	3,900.00	+900.00	
Pound service	2,225.00	3,500.00	3,500.00	+1,275.00	
Child Welfare Society, aid to	48,360.00	52,000.00	54,000.00	+5,640.00	+2,000.00
Total, health department	399,455.00	425,580.00	427,590.00	+28,135.00	+2,000.00
COURTS AND PRISONS					
Juvenile court	61,910.00	67,360.00	65,740.00	+3,830.00	-1,620.00
Police court (including \$1,600 in the second deficiency act of 1928 for compensation of jurors)	142,350.00	145,040.00	142,620.00	+270.00	-2,420.00
Municipal court	74,536.00	83,270.00	83,270.00	+8,734.00	
Supreme court:					
Salaries (includes \$10,000 in supplemental estimates)	74,900.00	86,100.00	86,100.00	+11,200.00	
Witness fees	33,000.00	32,000.00	32,000.00	-1,000.00	
Jurors, fees of	82,000.00	79,000.00	79,000.00	-3,000.00	
Balliffs	41,903.00	44,620.00	44,620.00	+2,717.00	
Probation system	9,420.00	10,000.00	10,000.00	+580.00	

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1930—continued

Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for the fiscal year 1929, the Budget estimates for the fiscal year 1930, the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1930—Continued

Object	Appropriations for 1929	Estimates for 1930	Amount recommended in the bill for 1930	Increase (+) or decrease (—) bill compared with 1929 appropriations	Increase (+) or decrease (—) bill compared with 1930 Budget estimates
COURTS AND PRISONS—continued					
Courthouse:					
Care of.....	\$29,704.00	\$35,000.00	\$35,000.00	+\$5,296.00	
Repairs and improvements.....	2,500.00	5,800.00	5,800.00	+3,300.00	
Court of appeals:					
Salaries.....	62,640.00	66,150.00	66,150.00	+3,510.00	
Building.....	7,800.00	9,120.00	9,120.00	+1,320.00	
Miscellaneous:					
Support of convicts.....	120,000.00	110,000.00	110,000.00	-10,000.00	
Writs of lunacy.....	8,530.00	8,720.00	8,720.00	+190.00	
Miscellaneous expenses.....	35,000.00	60,000.00	60,000.00	+25,000.00	
Printing and binding.....	4,500.00	4,200.00	4,200.00	-300.00	
Total, courts and prisons.....	790,693.00	846,380.00	842,340.00	+51,647.00	-\$4,040.00
Board of Public Welfare: Salaries.....	97,770.00	107,900.00	107,900.00	+10,130.00	
Division of Child Welfare: Administration.....	5,000.00	4,000.00	4,000.00	-1,000.00	
Board and care of children.....	160,000.00	230,000.00	230,000.00	+70,000.00	
Home care for dependent children.....	125,290.00	133,200.00	133,200.00	+7,910.00	
Reformatories and correctional institutions:					
Detention of minor children.....	25,000.00	40,000.00	40,000.00	+15,000.00	
Jail.....	128,310.00	142,045.00	142,045.00	+13,735.00	
Workhouse and reformatory (administration).....	15,400.00	17,000.00	17,000.00	+1,600.00	
Purchase of land.....	2,650.00			-2,650.00	
Workhouse.....	387,735.00	355,060.00	355,060.00	-32,675.00	
Reformatory.....	218,980.00	243,380.00	193,380.00	-25,600.00	-50,000.00
National Training School for Boys.....	40,000.00	40,000.00	40,000.00		
National Training School for Girls.....	72,140.00	77,100.00	77,100.00	+4,960.00	
Medical charities:					
Columbia Hospital.....	17,000.00			-17,000.00	
Children's Hospital.....	27,000.00	18,000.00	18,000.00	-9,000.00	
Providence Hospital.....	15,300.00			-15,300.00	
Garfield Memorial Hospital.....	15,300.00			-15,300.00	
Emergency Hospital.....	23,000.00	25,000.00	25,000.00	+2,000.00	
Eastern Dispensary.....	15,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00		
Washington Home for Incurables.....	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00		
Georgetown University Hospital.....	7,200.00			-7,200.00	
George Washington University Hospital.....	7,200.00			-7,200.00	
Columbia Hospital and Lying-in Asylum.....	55,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00	-40,000.00	
Tuberculosis Hospital.....	125,860.00	140,000.00	140,000.00	+14,140.00	
Gallinger Municipal Hospital, including \$150,000 supplemental estimate.....	816,155.00	708,600.00	708,600.00	-107,555.00	
District Training School.....	174,850.00	282,750.00	287,750.00	+112,900.00	+5,000.00
Industrial Home School (colored children).....	57,125.00	62,960.00	62,960.00	+5,835.00	
Industrial Home School.....	53,150.00	55,500.00	55,500.00	+2,350.00	
Home for Aged and Infirm.....	115,910.00	171,900.00	171,900.00	+55,990.00	
Miscellaneous:					
Municipal Lodging House.....	6,360.00	6,660.00	6,660.00	+300.00	
Soldiers and sailors' homes.....	12,860.00	13,800.00	15,800.00	+2,940.00	+2,000.00
Florence Crittenton Home.....	4,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	+1,000.00	
Southern Relief Society.....	10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00		
National Library for the Blind.....	5,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00		
Columbia Polytechnic Institute for the Blind.....	3,000.00	3,000.00	3,000.00		
St. Elizabeths Hospital, insane at.....	1,448,250.00	1,572,000.00	1,572,000.00	+123,750.00	
Nonresident insane, deportation of.....	5,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00		
Poor, relief of:					
Medical attendance.....	8,000.00	7,500.00	7,500.00	-500.00	
Support of prisoners' dependents.....	2,500.00	3,500.00	3,500.00	+1,000.00	
Burial of indigent ex-service men.....	225.00	225.00	225.00		
Transportation of indigent persons.....	3,500.00	3,500.00	3,500.00		
Total, public welfare.....	4,322,020.00	4,529,580.00	4,486,580.00	+164,560.00	-43,000.00
MISCELLANEOUS					
Militia.....	50,400.00	52,900.00	52,900.00	+2,500.00	
Anacostia River and Flats.....	180,000.00	180,000.00	180,000.00		
Total, miscellaneous.....	230,400.00	232,900.00	232,900.00	+2,500.00	
PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND PUBLIC PARKS					
Salaries.....	355,460.00	405,000.00	405,000.00	+49,540.00	
Improvement and care of parks:					
General expenses.....	486,975.00	493,000.00	530,000.00	+43,025.00	+37,000.00
Protective wall (supplemental estimate).....		40,000.00	40,000.00	+40,000.00	
Park police:					
Salaries.....	150,000.00	152,000.00	152,000.00	+2,000.00	
Miscellaneous.....	13,900.00	12,400.00	12,400.00	-1,500.00	
Total, public buildings and public parks.....	1,006,335.00	1,102,400.00	1,139,400.00	+133,065.00	+37,000.00
National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....	850,000.00	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00	+150,000.00	
National Zoological Park (including \$220,000 contained in a supplemental estimate).....	182,050.00	423,000.00	423,000.00	+240,950.00	
Grand total, exclusive of water service.....	\$ 36,105,598.00	37,061,792.00	36,717,820.00	+612,222.00	-343,972.00
Amount payable from District revenues.....	\$ 25,587,992.44	28,061,792.00	27,717,820.00	+612,222.00	-343,972.00
Amount payable from United States Treasury.....	9,000,000.00	9,000,000.00	9,000,000.00		
WATER SERVICE					
(Payable from water revenues)					
Washington Aqueduct:					
Operation, salaries, etc.....	425,000.00	441,000.00	441,000.00	+16,000.00	
Water department:					
Salaries, inspection, and distribution branches.....	144,360.00	154,800.00	154,800.00	+10,440.00	
Maintenance.....	335,000.00	365,000.00	365,000.00	+30,000.00	
Extension of water mains.....	250,000.00	250,000.00	250,000.00		
Installation of meters.....	30,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00		

Includes \$12,100 in second deficiency act of 1928.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1930—continued

Comparative statement of the amounts appropriated for the fiscal year 1929, the Budget estimates for the fiscal year 1930, the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1930—Continued

Object	Appropriations for 1929	Estimates for 1930	Amount recommended in the bill for 1930	Increase (+) or decrease (-), bill compared with 1929 appropriations	Increase (+) or decrease (-), bill compared with 1930 Budget estimates
WATER SERVICE—continued					
Installation of hydrants.....	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00	-----	-----
Laying water mains, etc.....	297,350.00	204,530.00	204,530.00	-\$92,820.00	-----
Total, water service.....	1,531,710.00	1,495,330.00	1,495,330.00	-36,380.00	-----
Grand total, including water service.....	37,637,308.00	38,557,122.00	38,213,150.00	+575,842.00	-\$343,972.00
SUMMARY					
Salaries, including \$3,800 in second deficiency act, 1928, and \$240,000 in supplemental estimates.....	2,165,865.00	2,609,701.00	2,615,679.00	+448,814.00	+5,978.00
Contingent and miscellaneous.....	223,700.00	275,916.00	274,701.00	+51,001.00	-1,215.00
Street and road improvement and repair, including \$160,000 in supplemental estimates.....	4,078,400.00	3,782,400.00	3,745,500.00	-332,900.00	-36,900.00
Sewers.....	1,526,000.00	1,451,000.00	1,476,000.00	-50,000.00	+25,000.00
Collection and disposal of refuse.....	1,576,740.00	1,613,900.00	1,613,900.00	+37,160.00	-----
Public playgrounds.....	190,610.00	198,060.00	198,060.00	+7,450.00	-----
Electrical department.....	1,140,180.00	1,145,055.00	1,140,430.00	+250.00	-4,625.00
Public schools, including \$494,000 contained in supplemental estimates.....	12,150,530.00	12,087,580.00	11,846,000.00	-304,530.00	-241,580.00
Metropolitan police.....	3,141,545.00	3,129,190.00	3,083,950.00	-57,595.00	-45,240.00
Police and firemen's relief fund.....	850,000.00	(Indefinite.)	(Indefinite.)	-850,000.00	-----
Fire department, including, for 1927, \$32,000 in deficiency act.....	2,130,015.00	2,209,140.00	2,171,790.00	+41,775.00	-37,350.00
Health department.....	399,455.00	425,590.00	427,590.00	+28,135.00	+2,000.00
Courts and prisons.....	790,693.00	846,380.00	842,340.00	+51,647.00	-4,040.00
Public welfare (including \$150,000 contained in supplemental estimate).....	4,322,020.00	4,529,580.00	4,486,580.00	+164,560.00	-43,000.00
Miscellaneous.....	230,400.00	232,900.00	232,900.00	+2,500.00	-----
Public buildings and public parks.....	1,006,335.00	1,102,400.00	1,139,400.00	+133,065.00	+37,000.00
National Capital Park and Planning Commission (including a \$400,000 supplemental estimate).....	850,000.00	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00	+150,000.00	-----
National Zoological Park (including a \$220,000 supplemental estimate).....	182,050.00	423,000.00	423,000.00	+240,950.00	-----
Total, exclusive of water service.....	36,105,598.00	37,061,792.00	36,717,820.00	+612,222.00	-343,972.00
Water service.....	1,531,710.00	1,495,330.00	1,495,330.00	-36,380.00	-----
Total, including water service.....	37,637,308.00	38,557,122.00	38,213,150.00	+575,842.00	-343,972.00
Permanent and indefinite appropriations:					
Refunding taxes.....	50,000.00	55,000.00	55,000.00	+5,000.00	-----
Extension of streets and avenues.....	175,000.00	500,000.00	500,000.00	+325,000.00	-----
Escheated estates relief fund.....	5,000.00	2,500.00	2,500.00	-2,500.00	-----
Teachers' retirement fund.....	340,000.00	390,000.00	390,000.00	+50,000.00	-----
Miscellaneous trust fund deposits.....	950,000.00	825,000.00	825,000.00	-125,000.00	-----
Washington redemption fund.....	500,000.00	550,000.00	550,000.00	+50,000.00	-----
Permit fund.....	50,000.00	55,000.00	55,000.00	+5,000.00	-----
Police and firemen's relief fund.....	650,000.00	675,000.00	675,000.00	+25,000.00	-----
Total, permanent annual and indefinite appropriations, District of Columbia.....	2,720,000.00	3,052,500.00	3,052,500.00	+332,500.00	-----
Grand total, regular annual and permanent and indefinite appropriations.....	40,357,308.00	41,609,622.00	41,265,650.00	+908,342.00	-343,972.00

³ Not included in total.⁴ Including \$12,100 in second deficiency act, 1928.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee charged with the responsibility of looking into the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia, I feel it is my duty to give to the House such information as I may have with reference to this matter. I desire to impress on the minds of the Members of the House that they should not be misled by the statements made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS], chairman of the subcommittee, when he mentions that the committee did this or the committee did that, or the committee recommends this or the committee recommends that. The fact is that as far as I know the subcommittee had very little to do with the preparation of this bill or the report accompanying it that is now before you.

The first time I saw the bill or the report was when I appeared at a meeting of the full Committee on Appropriations to report the bill to the House. That is equally true of my colleague, Mr. GRIFFIN, of New York.

I feel that there is a system growing up in this House with reference to these appropriation bills, and particularly with reference to this District bill, that should be brought to the attention of the House, so that you may understand just what it is.

I was present in the city all the time during the hearings on this bill, with the exception of two days when it was necessary for me to go to Harrisburg, being president of the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, to attend the State legislature's conference to prepare labor's legislative program to be presented to the legislature now in session.

I did not arrive in Washington on January 3, the first day of the hearings, because I had been seriously ill, but I have been in the city all of the time since my arrival on the 4th of January, with the exception of the two days I have just mentioned.

I know of no meeting having been called by the chairman of the subcommittee to mark up this bill; that is, to prepare the language that was to go into the bill or the report. I know of no meeting where the members of the subcommittee were called

together to decide what items should or should not go into the bill. I do not know who wrote the bill. Neither do I know who wrote the report. You have before you a bill and a report accompanying it, supposedly prepared by the subcommittee. The report recommends the passage of the bill by the committee, when, as a matter of fact, the subcommittee never saw the bill or report until yesterday. I have no desire to quarrel with anybody; neither have I any desire to enter into personalities with reference to this matter. Personalities should not be indulged in during the consideration of legislation, but facts and systems should be discussed and that is what I propose to do in the short time at my disposal.

The committee's report would lead you to believe, and so would the statements of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, that the subcommittee had discussed this lump-sum appropriation and had arrived at a conclusion upon it. The fact is that since I have been a member of the subcommittee the subcommittee has never discussed this question. They have never been permitted to discuss it. I am not an advocate of the 60-40 plan or any other similar plan, because I do not believe they are fair to the Federal Government. I do not say that I am opposed to the lump-sum proposition of \$9,000,000. I do say that I do not know whether it is right or not. Such investigation as I have made into this matter, the available information I could get upon it, leads me to believe that the person who guesses at a lump sum of \$9,000,000 may be correct, but that he is no more correct than the man who would guess at lump sum of \$15,000,000 or \$5,000,000. We simply do not know, and while the present law provides that we shall pay on the 60-40 basis, the law has been set aside by the Congress upon the theory that the lump sum would save the Federal Treasury money, and because of that it comes within the Holman rule.

Much criticism has been made because of the report of the Bureau of Efficiency upon this question, criticism by the citizens and the newspapers of the District of Columbia. I am

not prepared to say whether this criticism is just or not, because I have not had the time to study the report as I would like to. I believe the report of the Bureau of Efficiency on the fiscal relations between the District of Columbia and the Federal Government is something that should be welcomed by everybody, because for the first time to my knowledge we have a concrete proposition laid before us by an impartial tribunal, which we can add to or take from, and in this way we may arrive at a satisfactory and equitable adjustment of this troublesome question of the fiscal relations between the Federal Government and the District of Columbia. I simply repeat that I do not know what the proper amount should be. I say our subcommittee has not discussed it, we were not permitted to discuss it, and I do not want the Members of the House to understand, from what the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee says in reference to this matter, that his statements carry with it the approval of myself or my colleague on the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN].

I find unfortunately both for the Congress and the people of the District of Columbia, that there is a misunderstanding that should be cleared up. Congress seems to be in the attitude of being against everything that the people of the District of Columbia want. This is unfortunate. Congress undertakes to criticize the people of the District because the tax rate is \$1.70. That is held up as an illustration of why Congress should be hostile to the people of the District of Columbia. As a matter of fact the people of the District of Columbia have nothing to say about what their tax rate shall be. This House fixes this tax rate for the District of Columbia, and this House must accept the responsibility for the low tax rate in the District.

We provide in this bill that the authorities of the District of Columbia shall not have the authority to reduce the tax rate below \$1.70, notwithstanding the fact that this tax rate has created a surplus that is accumulating in the Treasury, because Congress will not authorize the expenditure of sufficient money necessary for proper improvements in the District of Columbia. So long as we limit the expenditures of the District of Columbia as we do in this bill and every other bill and prevent the people of the District of Columbia from making the necessary improvements, it naturally follows we must in all fairness assume the responsibility. They are prohibited from spending any money other than that authorized by the bills passed by Congress.

Much has been said on this question, and I do not propose to go into it at any greater length, except to say that in my judgment you and I and the rest of the membership of this House are responsible for the low tax rate in the District of Columbia, and we should assume full responsibility for it and not try to shift it upon the citizens of the District. When we fix the amount that can be spent by the officials of the District we, of course, fix the tax rate.

You have been told that there is a surplus in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia, and you have been told that there is no need for additional school facilities, notwithstanding that there are at the present time 6,000 children in the District of Columbia who attend school on what is called part time. That means that one child will go to school this morning and another child remain at home; the child who remains home in the morning will take the place of the child who went to school in the morning by going in the afternoon. This means that 6,000 children in the District of Columbia are being robbed of their education and additional and unnecessary burdens are being imposed on their parents. The hearings show, and the facts will demonstrate, that we have established a 5-year building program for our public-school system in the District of Columbia. The facts will also show that we are \$3,500,000 behind in appropriations for providing for school facilities for the proper accommodation of the children in the District of Columbia; I believe this is a matter that Congress should be interested in.

The hearings will show that the school authorities have repeatedly asked for appropriations to keep abreast of the 5-year program, but notwithstanding their urgent requests we are \$3,500,000 short of the 5-year program. In addition to this, we have approximately 75 or 80 portable schools that are moved from place to place to relieve the load in certain sections when conditions become so congested that they can not handle the school children—these shacks which are moved from place to place at best poorly lighted, poorly heated, poorly ventilated, and are nothing more than insanitary makeshifts in which we compel the children of the District of Columbia to attend school. I believe Congress should be interested in this matter, and I believe further that Congress should appropriate sufficient money for the erection of proper

public school buildings in all parts of the District of Columbia so that these 6,000 children now on half time and these 3,000 or 4,000 children housed in these poorly ventilated, insanitary, portable buildings, may be put in proper schoolrooms and the makeshifts destroyed.

We also have a situation in the District of Columbia with reference to sewers to which I wish to direct attention.

We have, and the testimony will corroborate my statements, subdivisions in the District of Columbia with 35,000 or 40,000 people living in thickly populated and congested centers without a sewer or a water pipe, and where the outside toilets, or privy closets as they call them, are increasing year by year. There is no justification for a condition of that kind in the Capital City of the great United States, and, further, let me say that these insanitary privy closets which I am talking about, in many instances, because of the seepage from them, have destroyed the only source of water in those neighborhoods, viz, the wells that are located there. Further than that, you should know we appropriate approximately \$25,000 a year to empty these privy closets of night soil, as it is termed in the bill, and what is done with this night soil? Is it dumped into the river? Is it cremated as it ought to be in sewage disposal plant or crematory or in any other sanitary way? No; it is not. It is sold to the truck farmers adjacent to the city of Washington and used as fertilizer to grow vegetables which are sold to the people of the District of Columbia. Is it not about time that Congress undertook to put a stop to this insanitary and unjustifiable condition?

Congress has a duty to perform in protecting the health of the people of the city of Washington. Congress should not sit idly by and permit these things to exist. Last year I called attention to the fact that beautiful Rock Creek Park, with that beautiful stream running through it, where you will find signs along its shore, "No bathing, no bathing," and where you will find during the summer months thousands of citizens of Washington and their families eating their dinners every Saturday afternoon and Sunday. I have seen them going to the creek and washing their plates, knives, and forks. And no doubt some of the children, not knowing any different, drink some of the water, and after eating their food their dishes are again washed in Rock Creek, which is an open sewer. That is why children and people are not permitted to bathe in it. No effort is made to eliminate these conditions. Congress, I repeat, should be interested. This House should be interested, and I believe it is about time they should do something of a practical nature to bring about the elimination of these conditions.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BYRNS. Is not what the gentleman says more of an indictment of the officials of Washington, who are charged with the expenditure of this money, than of Congress, which makes the appropriation?

Mr. CASEY. In reply to the gentleman from Tennessee let me say that I have been going over the hearings very carefully and tried as best I could to place the responsibility, but in every instance it has led right back to the House of Representatives, because the officials say that they have not sufficient funds, and Congress will not give sufficient funds to eliminate those very bad conditions.

Mr. BYRNS. Now, if the gentleman will pardon me, let me say this: I have in mind a city which has in population over one-third and not quite half of the population of the city of Washington. I happen to know that that city has splendid sewers. It is properly taken care of, and so far as I know there is no particular complaint upon the part of the citizens of that city, and yet I dare say that the annual budget of that city is not one-tenth of that for the city of Washington. Now, I would like to understand why it is that this condition of which the gentleman complains exists, in view of the fact that appropriations are made for the city of Washington which in this particular instance are ten times more than the amount appropriated for the city I have in mind, although that city is over one-third as large as the city of Washington?

Mr. CASEY. Of course, there may be many reasons entering into it which I have not time to discuss. One factor is we set the tax rate here and we limit the expenditure. And in further reply to the gentleman from Tennessee, let me say that I can see no justification for the House of Representatives being bound by the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget in the passage of this bill for the District of Columbia. I can see the necessity and appreciate the importance of following as closely as we can the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget in the consideration of all other appropriation bills except this one, because the appropriations in the other bills come out of the Federal Treasury; but for this bill there is a

fixed sum, a rigid amount of \$9,000,000. If the people of the District of Columbia want to build more schools, want to build more sewers, want to make this city more sanitary and more beautiful, then the people of the District of Columbia ought to be permitted to do it out of the taxes they pay.

They should not be estopped from doing those things—making those very necessary improvements—simply because we will not let them do it. That is no excuse, especially when the money for these improvements comes out of the taxes paid by the citizens of the District of Columbia.

I just want to take a moment or two on the question of the District employees' salaries, and then I have finished. When the bill for the fiscal year 1929 was before the House for its consideration it carried an item of approximately \$170,000 for step-ups, as recommended by the Bureau of Efficiency, for the employees of the District doing like work to those in the Federal departments. At that time it was stated on the floor of the House by every member of the subcommittee and also by the report of the committee to the House that this was a 2-year program. The reason for that was that the Bureau of the Budget recommended to Congress in last year's bill an item of approximately \$37,000 for necessary step-ups, as provided by law. When the subcommittee looked into the matter we found that instead of \$37,000 being sufficient to comply with the law, it took over \$340,000. This is the amount which rightfully belonged to these poorly paid employees of the District of Columbia and which had been taken from their pay envelopes—this amount of \$340,000 rightfully belonged to these employees and should have, in all fairness, been given to them in the last bill; if this had been done as it should, there would not be any question about it at this time. The experts were put to work on this question, and the more they dug the worse it got.

Finally they arrived at the conclusion that the employees of the District of Columbia were the farthest below the average of their grade of any employees of the Federal Government in the District, or lower than the average in the 33 departments of the Federal Government, with the result that it was agreed that this \$340,000 plus rightfully belonged to these employees; but at the suggestion of the distinguished chairman of the committee at that time, our good friend Mr. Madden, a 2-year program was agreed upon, to the effect that approximately half of the amount due these employees would go into last year's bill, with the solemn promise that the other half would go into the bill now before us for our consideration.

That promise has been broken. It is said that the Welch Act took care of this matter. That is not so. The understanding at the time this agreement was arrived at was that there was honestly and justly due the District employees \$340,000 plus, and that it should be given to them in order to bring them up to the level of the average of their grade and put them on a comparable basis with the Federal employees in the District of Columbia doing like work, and that if the Welch Act or any other act passed by Congress increased the salaries of the Federal employees and the District employees, that this subsequent increase was to be added to the base pay set for the District employees by the addition of this \$340,000.

You are told that since the passage of the last District appropriation bill the salaries of these employees have been increased twice, and in some instances three times, as a justification for keeping out of this bill the \$165,000 that rightfully belongs to the employees of the District. They tell you that \$500,000 or \$700,000 has been added to their pay. But they do not tell you what their minimum salaries are. They do not tell you about the poorly paid employees of the District of Columbia, and that the salaries now paid, with these three increases, have not been brought up to the level of the average of their grade.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CASEY. I yield myself 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes more.

Mr. CASEY. The admission that they had to give these poorly paid employees three increases, to give these employees two or three additional step-ups in the past year, confirms every statement I made on the floor of this House during the consideration of the last bill providing for the expenses of the District of Columbia.

I want to say to you very frankly, my friends, that I sincerely trust a better understanding will be had between Members of this House and the officials and people of the District of Columbia. The people of the District of Columbia want to make these improvements but Congress will not permit them to do so. The responsibility is ours. An increase in taxes of 5 cents would put into the Treasury \$600,000 or more per year. An increase of the taxes for the District of Columbia of 10

cents, making the tax rate \$1.80 instead of \$1.70, would put into the Treasury \$1,200,000 which could be used for these improvements.

But it is not necessary to increase the taxes. With the tax rate now set by Congress, not by the people of the District of Columbia, of \$1.70, they are able to pay for everything authorized in this bill or in the bill passed last year and still have a surplus which, according to statements made to you this morning, by July 1, 1930, will amount to \$10,000,000.

Why should the people of the District of Columbia pay taxes to the extent that after paying for everything authorized by Congress there accumulates in the Treasury \$10,000,000, while they have sections or subdivisions of the District without sewers or water mains, while there are 3,500 children housed in these poorly lighted and poorly heated and insanitary portable buildings called schools; while there are 6,000 children in the District of Columbia who are being deprived of an opportunity for an education because of the lack of proper school facilities and are only permitted to attend school half time? Congress should look into this matter; it is a very serious question. If it was not so serious, I would be tempted to say it is a farce. But it has gone beyond that. It is a real tragedy, and unless it is corrected I apprehend that some day it will become a national scandal.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time. [Applause.] Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOLADAY] 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, before referring specifically to two or three objections that have been made to this bill, I feel that I should not allow to pass unnoticed the remarks of the gentleman [Mr. CASEY] who just preceded me with reference to the matter of hearings upon this bill.

During my legislative experience I have always proceeded on the theory that it was my duty to attend a committee hearing, and that if I did not attend that hearing I should not object to what occurred in that meeting; or, if attending the committee hearing and not understanding what was being done, I surely would not voice an objection after the conclusion of the hearing. The members of the subcommittee were notified that this committee would meet on the 3d day of January, and we did meet on that day, and on the completion of the hearing that day we adjourned to a certain hour on the following day; and that proceeding was followed until the hearings were completed, sessions being held generally in the forenoon and in the afternoon. I was present at all of these hearings with the exception of one session, when it was necessary for me to be absent, and I availed myself of the opportunity afforded to ascertain the character of the proceedings of the session which I did not attend.

After the hearings were completed the committee proceeded, page by page, to mark up this bill. The language of the bill was discussed. Certain matters that were subject to a point of order were discussed. The fiscal relations question was discussed. The report of the Bureau of Efficiency was received and discussed. As far as I am concerned, as one member of that committee who attended the sessions of the committee, I have no objection to the manner in which the hearings were had.

Yesterday the gentleman from New York—

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman is leaving that part of his speech, does he mind an interruption?

Mr. HOLADAY. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am not sure that all Members quite appreciate the pressure under which a subcommittee handling an appropriation bill must work in order to suit the convenience of the House and keep these bills coming before the House in an orderly way. All of the appropriation bills contain many items, each of which requires examination and each of which is examined. In order to complete the hearings in the time that is permitted, get the bill whipped into shape and brought to the House it requires the most intense kind of application on the part of any subcommittee handling one of those bills. Now, as to the nature of the hearings, I have had some contact with the work of the Appropriations Committee for several years and some contact with the character of problems handled by this subcommittee. I want to say I do not believe there has ever been any committee of Congress that has developed the facts of a bill committed to its charge more thoroughly, more acceptably, and more capably than the subcommittee of which the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] is the chairman and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOLADAY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELSH], the gentleman from New York, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CASEY] are members. The House has in that set of hearings a splendid development

of the facts, and I think this subcommittee is entitled to a great deal of credit and commendation for its splendid work instead of any word of criticism.

Mr. HOLADAY. As I started to say, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] on yesterday, in a somewhat lengthy speech, summed up his objections by asking three questions near the close of his remarks, and I think we may assume that in those three questions were embraced about all of his material objections to the bill. The gentleman who has just preceded me this morning has, in a large part, voiced the same objections.

The first question asked by the gentleman from New York was with reference to the sanitary and sewer conditions of the District of Columbia and especially with reference to outdoor box privies. We must remember that the District of Columbia extends out into the country and we have east of the Anacostia River a territory in which there are living approximately 30,000 people. In great part it is sparsely settled and undeveloped as yet. In that territory there are approximately 3,500 box privies. The hearings of the committee show that to forthwith eliminate all of those privies would cost \$40,000,000, for the simple reason that in order to reach a house that may be situated out in the country, perhaps a quarter or a half mile from another house, yet within the District, it would be necessary to install a sewer for that one house. Now, what is being done with reference to the situation? This matter was especially called to the attention of the committee last year by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CASEY]. An investigation was made, and this year, as a result of that investigation and in furtherance of the general development of the District, we are starting on a 3-year program for the elimination, so far as it is feasible, of those objectionable features. This 3-year program carries for that purpose \$294,000—\$70,000 for grading; \$130,000 for sewers, and \$94,000 for water. We must remember that before sewer connections can be made the streets must be laid out; they must be brought to grade; the water mains must be installed; and then the sewer mains. This territory is being developed by people of limited means. They have gone out of the higher-priced sections of the District and are locating their little homes there and they do not desire, in many cases, that at the present time they be burdened with the additional expense necessary to make their homes modern. But that work is now being carried on under a definite program.

In addition to the \$294,000 expressly carried for this purpose, we are carrying an item of \$1,475,000 for street repair, grading, and extensions, a part of which will be used in this territory. We are also carrying a general item for the extension and replacement of water mains of \$320,000, a part of which will be used in this territory. We are also carrying an item of \$600,000 for suburban sewers, practically all of which will be used in this territory. So the House should understand that the committee has not been negligent in this matter, but is proceeding with a well-defined program that will gradually eliminate these undesirable features.

The second question was with reference to the sewage conditions in Rock Creek Park. I am going to read to you a half page of the hearings. The gentleman from Pennsylvania undoubtedly will recall this, because this was the day on which he was present. I am now reading from page 192 of the hearings. This question was asked by Mr. CASEY:

What, if anything, has been done toward eliminating the sewage from Rock Creek?

This answer was made by Mr. Gordon, the head of the sewer department:

Nothing, except that a rather detailed report has been prepared by me, which report might be of interest to you. I am bringing out very clearly in this report the fact that the pollution in Rock Creek is probably from 95 to 99 per cent from Maryland and but 1 to 5 per cent from the District of Columbia, and that to remove this 1 to 5 per cent pollution that might be contributed by the District we would have to spend about \$6,000,000.

The committee did not include the item of \$6,000,000 for the removal of from 1 to 5 per cent of this sewage, because we did not think it was a feasible and proper expenditure:

Mr. SIMMONS. Is Maryland making any effort to remove its part of the pollution?

Mr. GORDON. They are making an effort to remove certain portions of it. There was created the Washington Suburban Sanitary District, embracing portions of the counties adjacent to the District of Columbia, and the commissioners of this sanitary district are empowered to sell bonds and levy assessments for the purpose of extending the sewer system in the sanitary district, and they are doing this. The Washington Suburban Sanitary District embraces about one-third of the drainage area of Rock Creek lying outside of the District. In other words, about

19 per cent of the entire drainage area of Rock Creek lies within the District and 81 per cent lies outside of the District. Of that 81 per cent, one-third is gradually having sewers installed by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commissioners. This leaves about 55 per cent of the entire drainage area of Rock Creek, in which there are a number of growing communities, which will continue to pollute this stream.

The third question asked by the gentleman yesterday, and also mentioned by the gentleman from Pennsylvania this morning, was with reference to the school situation. Very recently Doctor Ballou, the superintendent of schools, furnished a report as of the date of November 1, 1928, in which he gave an itemized statement of the condition of school facilities and what was necessary to bring our school facilities 100 per cent up to date so that no new facilities would be needed. He lists the additional schoolrooms that are necessary to eliminate portables, 66; to eliminate rented quarters, 19; to eliminate undesirable rooms, 16.

Let me say here that those undesirable rooms are not all in one building, but they may be in a building that is in very good shape except that under pressure they are using one room or a hall or something of that kind that is not for the best interests. There are 16 in that class. To reduce oversized classes, 37; to eliminate part-time classes, 83; or a total of 221 rooms that are necessary.

Then he also sets forth a list of 90 rooms that should be, some time in the near future, abandoned, making a total of 341 rooms, of which 251 are recommended for immediate abandonment.

Now, remember, this is the report of the superintendent of schools, stating what is needed to bring the school system, so far as the housing facilities are concerned, up to 100 per cent, and this is all that is needed.

Now, what are we doing? Remember, this report was of November 1, 1928, and we needed 251 rooms.

School buildings that were opened between November 1, 1928, and January 17 this present month numbered 73 rooms.

Buildings appropriated for, plans now being drawn, or buildings under construction, 132 rooms.

This makes a total of rooms that have already been opened since the 1st of November or that are now under construction or that plans are being prepared for 205.

This bill carries additional buildings with a seating capacity for 3,343, or, at the usual average per room, 83 rooms.

So, when this bill is passed, with the rooms provided for in this bill, the rooms that are now under construction, and the rooms that have been opened since the 1st of November, we will have an additional 283 rooms, when the superintendent of schools has stated that it is only necessary that we have 251.

Let me now explain one other feature. Here is an item, for instance, of 66 portable rooms and an item of 16 rented rooms.

We find this condition: There is a new building constructed, we will say, of 16 rooms. When it is opened up it is 80 per cent filled. Gradually as two or three years pass by it reaches its maximum capacity, and then it begins to break over a little. It may be a building the normal capacity of which is 2,000, but it is breaking over, and it has an extra 100. This accounts for the oversized classes. We have 37 of them.

It may be that these oversized classes are one or two oversized—maybe six or eight—but it is not a feasible or an economical proposition to construct a new room to furnish accommodations for the one or two that come immediately at the break over.

So we will find that even with all the rooms constructed that we have now planned for we will continue, no doubt, to have here and there oversized classes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. HOLADAY. You may find in one building undersized classes, but across the city in another building there will be some oversized classes, because it is not feasible to take these children that distance and put them in the other school.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOLADAY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. How does the gentleman answer the question propounded by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CASEY], who wants to know why we should not go along more rapidly in respect of the matter of sewers and water and schools, inasmuch as there is such a large surplus being accumulated to the credit of the District of Columbia?

Mr. HOLADAY. We are using up that surplus. We are going on with the schools as fast as the school board is presenting its plans for new rooms. We even urged them to go a little faster, and we hope, I may say, to provide in the deficiency

bill a provision for another building. The school board did not have their plans prepared with reference to the location of the building on account of certain conditions in relation to the location of white and colored schools.

On the whole, I think the city schools of Washington to-day are in better shape than they have been in many years, and that they are on a basis that will compare very favorably with the schools of any of our other cities. [Applause.]

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an article by J. Ramsay MacDonald, ex-Premier of Great Britain, on the relations between America and England, which appears in the current number of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert an article by J. Ramsay MacDonald, ex-Premier of Great Britain, on the relations between America and Great Britain.

The article is as follows:

AMERICA AND ENGLAND
By J. Ramsay MacDonald

LONDON, January 10.

The relations between the United States and Great Britain grow increasingly unhappy. The usual committees of friendship are being formed—always an ominous sign, and the usual signals of a faith in doubt are being flown, such as: "War between the United States and Great Britain is unthinkable." When I hear that I am reminded of the sailor who in dire peril expressed a thankfulness that his religion was still left. The plain fact is that a spirit is growing up in the two countries which is estranging them, and is encouraging a kind of squabbling criticism which destroys mutual understanding and forbearance. It is very curious that the behavior of young creatures in nurseries so often illustrates that of nations toward each other. What each of nations requires at this moment is a good robust call from manly common sense.

One type of mind is peculiarly pernicious in such circumstances, that of the apostle of the inevitable. It has an alluring air of detachment, and yet of stoical submission to the decrees of Providence. To-day it murmurs as in a drowsy trance that great economic empires have always clashed and fought, that capitalist competition has always brought armaments competition, and that that in turn has always brought war. Therefore all that the United States and ourselves can do is to go on temporarily with our struggle for markets and rivalry for possession of furniture and old masters, and wait for the inevitable clash and crash decreed since the beginning of the world. Against this superstition and misreading of history every backbone sentiment of morality and common sense must be up in arms. Given governments which have minds to form rational policies, and a public opinion which represents an active will and is not merely a spill drifting upon the currents, war is no more inevitable than the smallpox, and the causes of war are just as controllable as insanitary conditions.

The European war left for the United States and England times full of petty irritation. The burdens of debt, revolutions in industry and in world markets, the problems of political readjustment in a world which has undergone more change than people really imagine, and, in some respects, the even more difficult mental readjustments that are called for are not good for an equable temper. And when we come down to actual business, we find ourselves still more immersed in the strangeness of the change which has taken place. The whole world to-day is calling for peace and security against war, and when a simple declaration against war which avoids every practical difficulty is put before the world, the world hails it with acclamation, signs it—and relapses. To those of us who believe that to bring the nations out of the war age is the divine task of this generation, the temptation to lapse into cynicism rather than continue in an energetic faith is very great when we find that armament expansion both in Europe and America has been decreed by the same hands and the same pens as signed a solemn bond to eliminate forever the consideration of war from national policies. There is something wrong somewhere. Somehow, the distinction in Christian conduct between Sunday and the rest of the week seems to be creeping into international policies.

The first reflection which we are apt to make on such a situation is that some nation other than our own is perfidious. That has the demerit of leading us nowhere except up the dangerous way of self-appreciation and it also happens to be inadequate as an explanation. The fact is that every nation is rent between two opposing and hostile moods. Everyone wants peace, but no one will accept and pursue a policy based upon peace assumptions. The practical policy of the United States and Great Britain is exactly the same as that which preceded and prepared for the late war. Let us both get to close grips with reality. We have

gone to Geneva to discuss naval armament, and we have both sent naval officers to do the negotiating. Both of us have begun with the assumption that war, involving our interests and safety, may break out. The duty of a naval officer is not to make peace, but to safeguard his nation's interests in time of trouble, and both you and we have an admirably able and honest body of men to advise us on that matter. At Geneva, it was not our mutual desire for peace that failed; it was not the impossibility of a peace policy that was demonstrated. It was a much simpler and very obvious thing. It was that, in the event of a war which brought us into conflict with each other, or that brought us separately into the strife, the naval arm that the United States would require for security would not be the same as that which England would require for security; that, indeed, if either the United States or England thought of security in relation to the hostility of each other, both of us would have to increase rather than diminish our shipbuilding. That was all that the Geneva failure proved. Was it really worth while going to Geneva for that purpose? Admirals as naval negotiators could not do other than bring out that obvious fact, and their negotiations could only expose the obvious. Then English papers and American started their fusillades. They missed completely the reason for the failure, and in good old-fashioned style went for the other side hammer and tongs. You patted yourselves on the back, kicked us, and we did exactly the same on our part; and the Atlantic became broader far and more stormy for both of us.

Then came our military—not only naval—agreement with France. For that I have nothing to say except that it illustrates the bungling of so much of our present Government's foreign policy. I do not believe that it was directed against the United States. It was simply stupid. It sacrificed our own national interests far more than it menaced yours. The country, irrespective of party, rose up and, following the lead of the Labor Party, rejected it. It would be highly improper for me to pass any opinion on the new American cruiser program; if I did so, it would quite properly be resented. But I may be allowed, as an outsider who is greatly concerned with the moral authority which every great State must possess if we are to secure the conditions of a world's peace, to say that the execution of that program will be a great blow to the Nation from which the Kellogg pact originated. You may consider it necessary to face that; but, make no mistake, the result will be the same as though my country had not declined to countenance the Anglo-French agreement. People will say: "Oh, yes; they boast of their declaration denying that war is to be a consideration in national policy, and with a simultaneous voice vote for a larger Navy," and if men can say that, it will be a bad thing for every movement seeking to establish a world peace.

Here in Europe those of us who are devoting our lives to the elimination of war from the national records of the times to come are nearer to the frontiers from which war alarms come than you are in America, and we, therefore, see phrases and words with a meaning in realistic policy somewhat different from the meaning you see in them. But we know that with America indifferent, or neutral, or pursuing its own way, our tasks are to be heavy and our defeat is to be more possible. Therefore it is imperative that steps be taken at once to end all this foolish and mischievous feeling which is alienating the United States from Great Britain.

The first thing to be done is to bring to a common table for discussion the reasons why ships are being built, why we both went to Geneva with the assumption we did, why we are thinking of trade routes being blocked, what there is between us that for immediate policy, newspaper writing, and political electioneering makes the Kellogg pact a mere collection of words strung upon a pious thread. The task of the statesmen is to make impossible the conditions upon which the masters of naval strategy spend their efforts. Why do not the statesmen act? If they are acting, why do they not give us comfort by informing us that they are? Is no attempt to be made, is none being made, to clear up the confusion of "the freedom of the seas"?

Has neither of us the courage to discuss with the other what the interests and obligations of both are in, and to, the world and each other? Have both of us failed to observe how easy it is for nations to slip into war for nothing, how ready popular imagination is to be set on fire by anyone—even an almost anonymous newspaper proprietor—who cares to light a match? This is no case for private and unofficial action and conferences. The governments must act. Both countries ought to appoint five or six of their most outstanding public men representative of the whole nation to meet and drag from the obscure corners of sulky suspicion the things which make difficulties between us. Let us know them. Mayhap fresh air would clear our minds of them. Governments are timorous, and if this be too solemn a proceeding for them to support, let them do something themselves, only we should like to be assured that they are aware of the mighty issues involved in a lack of real good will and confidence between the United States and Great Britain. No staging is too impressive for the importance of friendship between us, no pageantry too extravagant for the proclamation that difficulties have been removed. I want to involve the United States in no European escapade and no entanglements. It ought to praise its Creator night and day that that necessity is not imposed upon it, as it is, alas! upon us. But those of us whose lot is cast here,

and whose fate it is to struggle against the powers of militarism which have been wounded but certainly not killed in the late war, should like to feel that an American hand will always be placed in ours for encouragement, and that the relations between your country and mine can be held up to the world as an example of what we are striving to establish everywhere.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to-day shows that \$24,000,000 has been added to the deficiency bill for increasing the prohibition enforcement force, or such part thereof as the President may deem useful, to be allocated by the President as he may see fit to the departments or bureaus charged with the enforcement of the national prohibition act and to remain available until June 30, 1930. This is the first step toward an annual expenditure of about \$250,000,000 and an expenditure of over \$1,000,000,000 before the American people will be convinced that the prohibition law simply can not be enforced. Prohibition will be successful when fermentation can be stopped by an act of Congress.

In the meantime friends of prohibition can not escape the responsibility of accepting appropriations and making an honest attempt to enforce the law.

The letter from Secretary Mellon to the Senator from Wyoming does not describe fully actual conditions. The Secretary of the Treasury, to whose department the enforcement of prohibition is intrusted, either seeks to avoid responsibility or else has not the courage to frankly state to the American people his conclusions after 10 years of prohibition. Mr. Mellon, like everyone else in this country, must know that the attempted enforcement has been nothing short of a farce and a complete failure. More than five years ago I stated to the House that it would take over \$250,000,000 to commence to enforce prohibition. This estimate has been verified in the light of the experience of the past five years and the admission of Treasury Department officials.

After 10 years' experience the Treasury Department surely is in a position to know how it can at least commence to make a beginning at an attempt to enforce prohibition. If Secretary Mellon had been frank and honest about it, he would have stated that with \$25,000,000 or \$200,000,000 more the results would be about the same. Yet he should be able to immediately allocate additional funds and attempt to carry out the law to the extent that it is humanly and financially possible. His letter to the Senator from Georgia is evasive. He talks about the courts being congested. He seems to me to miss the point entirely that the additional funds can be used by him as a prevention to the commission of crime and not only for punitive purposes. In order that it might not be said that I am indulging in general criticism, I have prepared a tentative allocation of the \$24,000,000 in such a way as to make a real test at strategic points of the bootleg industry and so assign the force as to prevent violations of the prohibition law rather than bringing in thousands of cases for the trivial offense of having a pint of liquor in possession. Mr. Mellon suggests a "thoroughgoing survey of the entire field." With that in mind I submit to Mr. Mellon and the Treasury Department the following suggestions:

One of the points which has been the source of wholesale importation where enforcement has been so feeble as to be ridiculous is the port of Detroit. At this point a sufficiently strong force of men must be assigned to create a blockade. Importation of liquor in or about Detroit has grown to be an established industry running into millions and millions of dollars. About 50 men have been assigned by the Treasury Department for the Detroit district where thousands are employed in the export, import, and transportation of liquor. Now, here is the plan for Detroit.

The strategic points on the Canadian side are Riverside, Ford City, Walkerville, Windsor, Sandwich, Ojibway, and La Salle. These are the principal bases of operation. It is necessary to place a patrol watching each one of these points, as follows: I am taking a minimum force of 30 men, which next year would have to be increased:

Riverside, 30 men (3 platoons equals 90 men); Ford City, 30 men (3 platoons equals 90 men); Walkerville, 30 men (3 platoons equals 90 men); Windsor, 30 men (3 platoons equals 90 men); Sandwich, 30 men (3 platoons equals 90 men); Ojibway, 30 men (3 platoons equals 90 men); La Salle, 30 men (3 platoons equals 90 men); roving patrol for Detroit district, 50 men; total additional force, at \$3,000 per year (680 men).....	\$2,040,000
9 senior officers for this force, at \$4,000 a year.....	63,000
1 commanding field officer.....	5,000
20 patrol boats.....	120,000
40 motor-boat men, at \$2,000.....	80,000
Total for Detroit additional force.....	2,308,000

Experience has demonstrated that men exposed to patrol duty of this kind day after day should be worked in platoons of eight hours a day. It is necessary to have three platoons and a patrol on duty all of the time inasmuch as rum runners do not adhere to union schedule of hours and are on the job all the time. From past experience also it has been learned that fairly good pay must be provided. The men are in constant and daily temptations of bribe and corruption running into big figures. For this kind of work no less than \$3,000 a year should be paid unless, of course, the Government desires to turn their enforcement forces into protection patrols for the rum runners. I want to make it clear that the assignment of this force, large as it may seem, will not stop the smuggling of liquor from Canada. It will show how difficult, costly, and impossible the problem is.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. You have not provided anything to pay the men who are to watch these 30 men. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is for next year. We will come to that later.

The next spot where additional force is required in order to prevent violations is in and about the so-called denaturing plants. There are 82 denaturing plants in the United States. In 1928 no less than 159,689,378 proof gallons of alcohol were withdrawn for the purpose of being completely or specially denatured. To give an idea how this denaturing business has grown, it is only necessary to state that in 1907, 3,084,950 proof gallons of alcohol were withdrawn for that purpose. No matter who may be operating these denaturing plants, no matter how much they might have been investigated, no matter what supervision may be exercised over them at this time, the fact remains that this original source is not sufficiently controlled and supervised, and that there is an enormous leakage and diversion from this source. Honest plants will not complain of more rigid supervision. The others we need not worry about. Later on it will be necessary to increase the force, but for the present the department can start by assigning to each of these plants six additional men, as follows:

6 additional men to each plant (3 shifts equals 18 men for each plant); 82 plants times 18 equals 1,476 men, at \$3,000.....	\$4,428,000
6 supervisors, at \$4,000.....	24,000
10 accountant-auditors, at \$5,000.....	50,000
Total additional force, denaturing plants.....	4,502,000

These men can work under direct command of the zone administrators, and the supervisors would be used to check up on the men on a constant tour of inspection. The need of accountant-auditors is very important. While the men at the plant can physically watch operations, a great deal of the diversion is carried on by well-covered and seemingly honest business transactions. Auditors would have to check up on the raw material, follow the sales, verify destination, and in that way prevent covered diversions. There is so much at stake in this department that it would be unsafe to pay the employees any less than suggested.

BREWERIES

Last year there were about 308 breweries licensed to manufacture near beer. This number has now been reduced to 275. Everyone watching conditions knows that beer is flowing out of the kegs as fast as the law of gravitation will permit. This is especially true in Pennsylvania. The supervision at the licensed beer plants is apparently not sufficient. While some agents have been planted outside of breweries for a few hours a day, the work has been most ineffective. At least two additional men should be permanently placed at each plant manufacturing near beer. Of course, these men would also have to work in three shifts of eight hours each. This would be six men for each plant.

275 breweries times 6 men equals 1,650 men, at \$3,000 a year.....	\$4,950,000
10 accountant auditors for same services enumerated for denaturing plants above, at \$4,000.....	40,000
20 chemists, at \$5,000.....	100,000

Total additional brewery force.....	5,090,000
-------------------------------------	-----------

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. What amount of real beer does the gentleman say is sold in Pennsylvania, and where is it?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In Philadelphia, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, and all through.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. The gentleman does not mean to say that high-power beer is sold in large quantities in the city of Philadelphia?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; I do.

Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is mistaken in his information.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will take the gentleman in his own home town and we will go this week-end. [Laughter.]

I am assuming that recent reports from the Treasury Department and the Prohibition Division relative to the beer squads are correct and that these squads are functioning efficiently. Therefore I provided no additional force for the wildcat breweries and unlawful plants.

We now come to another source of diversion. The 82 denaturing plants deliver industrial alcohol to no less than 4,447 permittees, who may lawfully withdraw this denatured alcohol for ostensibly lawful purposes. It is these 4,447 manufacturers that use the millions of gallons of alcohol that the denaturing plants are supposed to provide. Many of the formulas are susceptible of being cooked and the poison partially taken out. At any rate, the fact remains that great quantities of denatured alcohol are diverted from its legitimate use and put into beverages. A greater part of these plants—I would say over 90 per cent of these plants—are without any supervision to speak of. Once in a while the perfunctory check up is made. If I were to suggest but 2 men to each plant working on a three-shift plan, that would require 26,682 men. I say now that if prohibition is to continue, the Government will be compelled to employ over 25,000 men to physically watch the operation of these four thousand-odd plants in order to prevent diversion. Now, instead of providing the full 26,682 men, I would take but one-fifth of that force. That will permit the four out of five permittees to continue their operation unchecked and uncontrolled. I repeat that the supervision now over these plants amount to nothing, and surely constitutes very little, if any, control. Here, too, we require a large force of accountant auditors. Perfume and soap houses sell to retailers and consumers who never receive an ounce of the products. It is all a bookkeeping fraud. Accountants will be able to follow up each sale, obtain canceled vouchers, and completely break up the system. By providing a force of 4,000 men, that would permit of less than one man for each plant. If plants are to be properly covered, it would permit the department to properly supervise but 366 of the 4,447 plants. By that I mean keeping the two men on the job throughout the day and night. Surely covering 366 plants out of 4,447 can not be said to be an unreasonable and wild estimate in order to ridicule the proposition; but just watch the cost:

4,000 men, at \$3,000, is	\$12,000,000
100 accountant auditors, at \$4,000	400,000
25 supervising officers, at \$4,000	100,000

Total for additional supervision of permittee manufacturers using denatured alcohol	12,500,000
---	------------

So much for the general proposition of building a skeleton force, and my estimates here are simply for a skeleton force which will have to be increased each year as I have previously indicated.

Now, something ought to be done as an experiment to curtail the constantly increasing number of illicit stills. It would be impossible to start in the 48 States at one time. Although I believe that when the Government will start to suppress production of alcohol in all of the States, and will enforce the law particularly in the dry States, with the same annoyance, persistence, graft, and corruption that is now being carried on in some of the large centers of the country, there will be such a protest and such a wholesale conversion of dries to the wet cause as to bring about a speedy and sensible adjustment of this vexing question.

To get back to the estimates, I have chosen two States in which the experiment for the coming year might be tried. This honor should go, of course, to the State of the gentleman who championed this increased appropriation; that is the State of Georgia. For the other State I have selected the Western State of Idaho.

I have taken these States and divided them into zones of 500 square miles, and have taken as a basis 10 Federal agents for every 500 square miles. No military authority or police officer would accept a mission of patrolling or policing 500 square miles with 10 men. I knew that if I took the normal number of men required to properly patrol a State in order to suppress illicit stills, manufacturers of liquor, and the transportation of liquor, in accordance with accepted military or police formulas, the figures would be so large as to cause me to be immediately charged by my dry friends and dry colleagues with purposely distorting the proposition by the use of exaggerated figures. There are 59,265 square miles in the State of Georgia. That would provide about 110 zones. Allowing 10 men to a zone will bring it up to 1,110 men.

While, of course, a great part of the State is totally unpopulated, where no patrolling is required, this would permit of the shifting of men and increasing the patrols in the centers of population and in the zones where topography of the land is mountainous and difficult. Half of these men would necessarily have to be mounted. That would require the purchase of 500 horses and their maintenance and upkeep. Five hundred horses, at \$165 a horse, the price paid for horses by the Army, \$82,500. It would cost to stable and keep these horses about \$12,500 a year. One thousand one hundred and ten men, at \$2,500 a year, would be \$2,750,000. Command of these men would add \$50,000 more, making a total, not counting cost of the horses, \$2,812,500. On the same basis, it would cost to put a small experimental Federal force in the State of Idaho, with its 83,888 square miles, excluding the cost of the horses, \$4,240,000.

To summarize, without the cost of the force in Georgia and Idaho, but simply partially reinforcing supervision and doing only preventive work would require under the most conservative figures that I have given \$24,400,000. If we add the two State experiments, it would bring an additional \$6,252,500, or a total of \$30,652,500. Now, I want to call attention to the fact that this does not take into consideration the patrolling of a single foot of Atlantic or Pacific or Gulf coasts. It would require thousands of men to prevent rum running along the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts. Taking the eastern coast of Florida alone, with its 400 miles of eastern coast, would require a force of over 1,500 men. It would take right now, that the season is on at Miami and Palm Beach, a force of 750 men to simply prevent the daily importations for the daily consumption of those two fashionable resorts.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. GIBSON. Does the gentleman's scheme contemplate the patrolling of the northern border and the southern border?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, we will have to do that gradually. This is only to absorb the \$24,000,000 offered by the other branch of Congress.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman is an authority on the prohibition question. Does he not think that this Congress should enact legislation which will prevent the foreign diplomats from importing intoxicating liquors? If the gentleman will look at last night's Washington Star he will see that the police attempted to confiscate a truck load of 800 quarts consigned to the French Embassy, but were prevented because it is held that the prohibition law does not apply to foreign diplomats. Why should foreigners in the diplomatic service be permitted to have hard liquor when the working men of this country can not have 2½ per cent beer?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Eight hundred quarts of what?

Mr. SCHAFER. Hard liquor.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The same conditions exist all along the coast, whether east, west, or south. If next year \$25,000,000 more is added, it might be possible to build up the skeleton force for the coast patrol. Gentlemen, it is going to be costly to convince some of you that you are dealing with an impossible proposition. I hope that every dry will carefully observe prohibition enforcement in order to convince himself that no matter how many millions of dollars we appropriate, it will not be possible to stop the traffic in liquor and the use of alcoholic beverages. Millions of gallons of liquor are consumed in this country every month. Gentlemen, bear in mind, that we have this enormous traffic in liquor not because we have thousands of bootleggers but because we have millions of consumers. [Applause.]

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen of the House, I want to refer briefly to an occurrence in the House last Monday when the Consent Calendar was under consideration. I refer particularly to the colloquy had in respect to Senate bill No. 1462, when the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS] was questioned as to the then present consideration of the bill by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. LEATHERWOOD], the gentleman from Utah asking the gentleman from Washington whether or not if the bill went over to the next consent day it would be called up for consideration later on. The answer was that it would be, and, if necessary, it was implied, that the bill would be considered under suspension of the rules.

I want to direct your attention for a few moments now as regards the question of expending the public money for reclamation projects in amounts such as are now taking place and as are apparently in immediate contemplation. It seems to me that it is very pertinent in connection with the problem for which the extra session of Congress is being urged, namely, the

consideration of farm relief legislation and the tariff. Certain it is in my mind; if these lavish expenditures are to be continued to reclaim additional lands for the purpose of increasing agricultural production, when the Congress is being called upon to finance surplus production it is time that we paid some very definite attention to the details of these various projects and understand the economic effect that such action has on the country as a whole.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the question, Should the Government now, under the circumstances, undertake reclamation of any additional lands?

In considering this matter let us briefly review the present status of Government reclamation work as reflected in official reports. Since creation of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Government has expended down to June 30, 1927, a total of \$183,887,241 reclaiming so-called desert lands. In 1927 the irrigable area of projects built by the Government was 1,956,910 acres, an increase of 112,360 over that of 1926. The gross value of crops grown on these projects in 1927 was \$72,047,200, an increase of \$11,677,580, compared with 1926. In addition to the above areas, the Government's reclamation projects supplied, under the Warren Act, water to 1,482,950 acres in 1927, an increase over the previous year of 153,930 acres. The gross value of crops grown on this Warren Act land was \$61,160,010, an increase of \$11,409,970 over that of the previous year. From the foregoing it will be observed that the total value of crops grown in 1928 on the 3,439,860 acres of irrigated land, furnished with water from the works of the Bureau of Reclamation, was \$133,207,210, an increase of \$23,087,550 compared with 1926. In 1927 the Government appropriated for construction the sum of \$9,869,000, compared with \$4,443,000 the previous year, both figures exclusive of reappropriations. During 1927 there was expended on construction \$6,966,449, compared with \$5,189,025 of the previous year. All works now under construction involve a further ultimate expenditure of \$90,000,000.

During the year the Guernsey Dam on the North Platte was completed; the Stony Gorge Dam on the Orland project in California was 90 per cent completed; the Gibson Dam on the Sun River project in Montana was 50 per cent completed; the work was under way on the construction of the Echo Dam under the Salt Lake Basin project in Utah, and on the Easton Diversion Dam, and other works of the Yakima project in Washington; preliminary work was begun on the Harper Diversion Dam and other structures on the Vale project in Oregon; contract was awarded and preliminary work begun on the structures of the Owyhee Dam, under the project of that name in Oregon. This last-named dam, when completed, will be the highest dam in the world, 43 feet higher than the 362-foot Schraech Dam in Switzerland. The estimated cost of this Owyhee Dam is \$5,378,125. The estimated cost of the dams and structures above mentioned, either completed or under way in 1927, is approximately \$11,000,000.

The Crisp bill, H. R. 8221, contemplates expenditure of \$10,000,000 in the purchase of "swamp, cut-over, neglected, abandoned, or poorly farmed land" in 10 Southern States, and in the creation therefrom of not less than 2,000 demonstration farms to aid, so we are told, in the settlement of waste lands. The Columbia Basin bill, S. 1462, contemplates irrigation of 1,833,000 acres at preliminary cost estimate for construction of works of not less than \$315,000,000.

Twenty-four Government reclamation projects are already in operation, with the products therefrom competing with those of agriculture produced from lands privately reclaimed.

This Government reclamation work has always been under the control of the Department of the Interior. The historical policy of the Department of the Interior has been to dispose of more lands to settlers. Under existing conditions the policy of the Department of Agriculture is to advise the curtailment of new land settlement and production of more crops—especially of those whereof we annually create a surplus. Is it sane for this Government to induce settlement of raw lands for further production at a time when it is urged that because of surpluses year after year the market prices for staple crops have been ruined? As a matter of fact, it is well known that for a long time past new settlers which the Government have been able to induce to occupy raw lands under these reclamation projects have mostly been either those little versed in farming pioneering or those who have through many inferences, and not a few positive relief acts of the Government, been led to believe that eventually the cost of reclamation charged against them will be canceled. The adjustment and relief furnished these settlers in the last fiscal year amounted to the sum of \$5,613,750.36. For 15 years the Bureau of Reclamation has been struggling with little success to secure settlers on the Milk River, Lower

Yellowstone, the Belle Fourche, and some of the other projects. In the 1928 Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior appears the following with reference to the Milk River project:

Efforts to secure settlers for unimproved land have failed. * * * The urgent need of this project is to secure more good farmers and place them on partially improved farms under conditions where they will succeed.

In the same report, referring to the Lower Yellowstone project, the Secretary states:

It has been found almost impossible to dispose of any unimproved farms without buildings. * * * The urgent need is for creation of an agency which will make and finance these needed improvements on long terms and at a low rate of interest. * * * Those who have unimproved farms and who are in the greatest need of assistance can not get Federal aid.

In the same report, referring to the Belle Fourche project, the Secretary reports an increase of—

Sixty-two resident operators over the low point of 1925. * * * These newcomers are principally tenants.

One of the objects of the Government undertaking reclamation work was to give the poor but worthy and aspiring farmer an opportunity to become a landowner, but apparently the conditions surrounding the reclamation efforts of the Government have all conspired to produce an increasing tenantry, instead of ownership. Thus, in 1927, we find that 39 per cent of the farms in the Yuma project were cultivated by tenants; that of the 1,768 irrigated farms under the Uncompahgre project in Colorado, 850 were cultivated by owners and 918 by tenants; that of the 182 irrigated farms in the King Hill project in Idaho, 121 were farmed by owners and 61 by tenants; that over 40 per cent of the farms under the Boise project were cultivated by tenants, and that tenancy in the Minidoka project increased from 41 to 44 per cent; that of the 584 cultivated farms under the Huntley project in Montana, 309 were cultivated last year by owners and 275 by tenants; of the 500 farms cultivated last year under the Milk River project, 262 were operated by owners or managers for owners and 238 by tenants; that under the Lower Yellowstone project, farm owners cultivated 270 farms and tenants 332; that under the Carlsbad project in New Mexico, 288 farms were cultivated by owners and 137 by tenants; that of the 4,669 farms in the Rio Grande project in 1927, 2,901 were operated by owners and 1,768 by tenants; that under the Shoshone project in Wyoming, 343 units were farmed by owners and 241 by tenants, and so forth.

Moreover, already it has come to pass that thousands of allotted units under the various projects can not be advanced further for lack of settlers with capital for needed building improvements, operation, and so forth. Thus, under the Belle Fourche project, 400 farms, according to the Secretary of the Interior, need building improvements before settlement can advance further, and quoting his words:

To accomplish desired results a credit fund of \$500,000 should be made available for these Belle Fourche project landowners for construction purposes. No money is available in this vicinity for real-estate loans, and short-time bank loans are made only on productive livestock at 10 per cent interest.

In all these cases, the Government having induced the settlement, what is the duty of the Government toward these settlers? And what should be the policy of this Government to avoid in the future recurrence of these positions, where the settlers demand and procure no interest charges under their purchase contracts, reduction of principal price, delays in making first payments, longer periods of amortization, and so forth? In his 1928 annual report the Secretary of the Interior states:

Few settlers have the capital required to convert a tract of raw land into a productive farm, the cost of improving, equipping, and operating farms having doubled in recent years. Hence the bureau is seeking a better type of farmer with more capital and skill.

It has seemingly now become the policy of the Bureau of Reclamation to desire to incorporate as a part of construction costs the preparation for immediate farming of at least part of the lands comprising the different units; that is, to clear and level such lands, and so forth. Such a step is reported as in accord with the recommendations of the different economic boards appointed to consider these newer projects.

These boards make land classifications, determine the size of farms, work out a program of agriculture adapted to the climate and soil, investigate cost of clearing, leveling and preparing land for irrigation, make estimates of costs of buildings, fences, livestock, and farm equipment for minimum requirements, and also estimates of operating expenses and farm

income; but when all is said and done, and representations as inducements to settlers to purchase have been made, based upon the findings of these boards, it would appear that at least in several instances, were the Government an individual and had it as an individual promoter utilized United States mails for the making of such representations, it would have been subject to prosecution for the use of the mails to defraud. Such are the repeated reports from many settlers.

And has the poor but worthy farmer a chance under these new projects? Dr. Alvin Johnson, recently employed by the Bureau of Reclamation as a social and economic expert, says concerning settlers' conditions under one of the later projects:

What they have now, what the bounty of the Government has given them, is only a Chinaman's chance—i. e., they have a chance, by subjecting themselves and their wives and children to a Chinese standard of living through four or five years, to come into the birthright of ordinary American citizens—an American standard of living.

Some time ago Congress was driven to the point where it prescribed as a condition precedent to the making of an allotment the possession by the contemplating settler of \$2,000 in cash or its equivalent in livestock and equipment. Do these projects now being constructed or those contemplated in pending legislation offer possibility of success to a settler thus equipped? As an example, let us consider this big new Owyhee project. There the economic board reported that a settler with \$2,500 capital could not succeed with even as small an allotment as 40 acres; that even were a settler with \$2,500 placed on a 40-acre tract wholly cleared and one-half planted to perennial legumes he could succeed only with the aid of the land bank. And it is well known there is no Federal aid for the settler who finds himself thus situated.

No wonder that even though the Reclamation Bureau should now go into the business, added to its other undertakings, of clearing and leveling the land, or go so far as to plant a part of the land, the great difficulty of securing settlers would still exist. This bureau employs competent agents trained in settlement work and the science of irrigation farming, but they can not find these settlers who have, as they should have, according to the findings of these economic boards, from \$7,500 to \$10,000 to develop a 40-acre dairy tract.

It may be all right for the Congress to say that settlers with \$2,000 in capital may be allotted units in these projects, but where can these settlers borrow an additional \$5,500 to \$8,000 to bring the smallest of these tracts into production? The Federal land bank makes loans only on developed farms from which the income is immediate and assured. Local banks can not make long-time loans. The director of reclamation economics of the Bureau of Reclamation in an address before the Oregon Reclamation Congress at Salem, Oreg., on November 15 last, stated:

No one is optimistic enough to believe that settlers can be secured with from \$5,000 to \$7,500 in sufficient numbers to settle these large areas of unimproved land rapidly enough to pay operation and maintenance charges and construction charges which will follow soon after the construction of irrigation works.

There is no hope for State aid because investigation shows that in most States there are constitutional prohibitions against the giving of aid of such a nature, although experience has shown that the States wherein these projects are located are the chief beneficiaries of the Government's expenditures; that these nearly worthless desert lands, producing little or no taxes, are upon reclamation and settlement taxed locally upon high assessed valuations.

The value of the Government's lien on the lands in these projects depends wholly on settlement. In a farm-depression crisis like the present, shall the Government which has thus unwittingly gotten into business, proceed to settle this land effectively and create competing crops, by forgiving debts, delaying initial settlements, prolonging amortization periods, and so forth?

But what shall be said of a contemplated undertaking like that mentioned above in the Columbia River Basin, which involves an outlay equal to twice the total sum expended to date on all other projects put together—a sum equal to the structural costs of the Panama Canal? No matter what may be said as to the length of time involved in the construction of these great contemplated works, there can be no argument that at the end of such a period the lands thereunder will be required for production. The quickness with which pasture lands and cut-over wood lots responded to the war demands for production taught us that unless it can be vouchsafed there will be a huge demand for exports, we have nothing to fear from scarcity of supply for our normally increasing domestic population.

From time to time, there have been more or less half-hearted efforts made to stop this orgy of expenditures through the Bu-

reau of Reclamation, but action taken has always been insufficient. Only the other day, the new Secretary of the Interior approved a large item of expenditure for new construction under an Idaho project involving creation of a power plant. It is interesting to note that as a side line in this reclamation business, the Government is in the power business, and that last year it sold surplus electrical energy under 50 contracts, receiving \$654,564.37.

In the report of the Secretary of Agriculture to the President, dated November 3, 1927, we read:

Although, like Canada and Australia, we formerly found it desirable to employ our land policy as a means of attracting immigration, we are now endeavoring to restrict immigration. Unlike some of the densely peopled countries of Europe, our output of farm products adapted to the climate is adequate and we have no scarcity of agricultural land. Although the Federal Government has disposed of practically all the lands of agricultural significance formerly in the public domain, there is still a vast area of potential crop land in private ownership. This area is estimated at more than 600,000,000 acres. A large proportion of this is fair to good land in woodland areas where only clearing is necessary. Such land, as well as large areas of potential crop land in semiarid regions, awaits only a sufficiently stimulating price for farm products to be brought quickly under the plow. In fact, this privately held land exerts at times an unfavorable influence on agricultural prosperity. * * * Temporary increases in farm commodity prices cause some of it to be brought into cultivation, and when prices fall there is no ready contraction in the new farm areas because of the difficulty of transferring the labor and capital put into them to other industries. Short-sighted expansion of the agricultural area in times of temporary prosperity is encouraged, moreover, by the potent influence of super-salesmanship exerted in the interest of land-selling agencies. * * * Experience has shown that when the outlook is sufficiently promising private enterprise can be depended on to reclaim new areas. * * * There is need for a comprehensive study of reclamation policies and of the reclamation projects now under construction or contemplated. The policy of giving settlers on Federal reclamation projects from 20 to upward of 40 years to repay construction charges without interest constitutes an extensive subsidy to agricultural expansion. * * * It was estimated in 1923 that on the basis of the terms of repayment of interest then existing the exemption of interest at 4 per cent amounted to nearly 46 per cent of the cost of construction. Since then the period of repayment has been greatly extended and the subsidy correspondingly increased. As no corresponding subsidy is enjoyed by private enterprise in the development and utilization of agricultural land the settlers on Government projects are given an important competitive advantage. * * *

Federal activity in the promotion of farm-land expansion seems particularly unwise when we reflect that a number of Federal reclamation projects are suffering seriously from depression aggravated by heavy overhead charges growing out of high costs of construction. * * * In general, proposals to enlist the funds and initiative of the Federal Government in stimulating agricultural expansion must cause concern to all persons interested in the farmer's welfare. With a huge reservoir of potential agricultural land, and strong forces tending constantly to stimulate expansion of the farm area, our land problem at present is not how to force land under the plow as rapidly as possible, but how to achieve a wise and economical allocation of our available land among major uses, such as crops, forests, and extensive grazing, and in such a way as to make farming on that land profitable.

How can we coordinate this constructive criticism with the promotion ideas of the Bureau of Reclamation? Mr. Chairman, it can not be done. Either we are to bury farming deep and for decades to come under these huge contemplated land-reclamation projects like Boulder Dam and Columbia River, or we will, statesmanlike, hold these vast competitive resources in reserve and undeveloped until such time as, stimulated by assured profits from farm production, settlers seek these lands at prices and on terms which will justify the employment of private capital to construct the necessary works. A not unimportant feature of any program of farm relief must be the forsaking by the Government of all thought of additional land reclamation. The so-called "revolving fund" of the Bureau of Reclamation now consists of approximately \$166,000,000, invested in long-term loans to settlers. As the payments under these loans are collected, they replenish this revolving fund, and thus such payments support new construction. Moreover, to such revolving fund is allocated a part of the funds received by the Government from sale of public lands.

Last year such allocation amounted to \$705,822.66. Moreover, 52½ per cent of all cash received by the Government as royalties from oil leases goes to this revolving fund, and thus last year this revolving fund was increased \$2,454,168.66 from such source. The total payment by settlers into this revolving fund last year was \$5,293,149.55. Omitting such large items as income from sale of surplus power, rental of water rights, and

so forth, and yet there flowed into such revolving fund during last fiscal year nearly \$10,000,000. When farming credit is not to be had and finances are needed for moving crops the farmers of this country can not understand their Government's diverting such funds year after year to the subsidizing of competition; nor can they understand the righteousness of their Government supporting an Agricultural Department advocating one policy and an Interior Department actively engaged in defeating such policy.

This question of further reclamation of arid lands is the least complex of any which will be presented for our consideration in formulating a correct legislative program for farm relief, but it is doubtful if even it can be correctly, thoroughly digested and solved by proper enactments at this session. Opportunity should be given for full presentation and consideration of all facts. I hope my remarks may put on notice those who would defend at the contemplated extra session the policy of further reclamation of lands by the Government.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I want to say that the bill to which the gentleman referred, which I had charge of on last consent day, does not contemplate at this time a reclamation project. It contemplates some investigations which must necessarily cover a number of years. The first unit of that project, when finally decided by the Bureau of Reclamation to be a feasible project and approved by the Congress and constructed, would go into cultivation about 20 years from now; and under the plan now contemplated the whole project would be developed in the course of about 40 years, when the population of the United States would be about 60,000,000 in excess of what it is now.

The production from that proposed project would take care of 1,000,000 of the 60,000,000 of increase, and would not interfere with consumption by the present population, nor of ten, twenty, thirty, forty, or fifty million of the increase of population. That project would only meet the needs of one-sixtieth of the increased population.

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes; but I say to the gentleman that this bill is the nose of the camel under the tent, and this will eventually involve a total expenditure on the part of the Government of probably \$350,000,000.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. No such draft on the Treasury is contemplated by those in charge of the project.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. I will yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. I was not so fortunate as to hear all of the gentleman's remarks, but only the latter portion of them, in which I thought the gentleman raised the question as to the advisability of utilizing power developed as an incident to irrigation work. Is that the position of the gentleman?

Mr. McFADDEN. I was referring to the receipts from the sale of power originating on these propositions—

Mr. CRAMTON. Prior to that the gentleman made the remark about the Government going into the power business, and I got the very general impression the gentleman felt we ought to discontinue more—

Mr. McFADDEN. No; I was simply giving facts in regard to the returns on these developments indicating there were power developments coupled with the reclamation projects, the total income being some \$600,000 last year.

Mr. CRAMTON. But prior to that?

Mr. McFADDEN. I was not specifically criticizing the developing of the properties once they had been acquired, and my remarks were directed generally to the policy of these large appropriations for the construction of reclamation projects, especially since the Congress is now about to take up the problem of dealing with the surplus products of the farms, and because we all know and understand that these great areas, so watered by these projects and otherwise improved, are produced in direct competition with the farm products of the whole country.

Mr. CRAMTON. I got that. I was more concerned about what seemed to be a criticism of the appropriations which have been passed by this House in reference to reclamation and the power developed in Idaho, for instance.

Mr. McFADDEN. I will say I believe much of that could be dispensed with at the present time, particularly when we are called upon to inaugurate a policy to provide for the marketing of the surplus products of the farms of the whole country.

Mr. CRAMTON. Just where would the gentleman draw the line as to the completion of the projects under way for furnishing needed water to settlers now on the land?

Mr. McFADDEN. If I was in charge I would have an examination made by proper engineers to determine what was best to do under the circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McFADDEN. And the sooner we get at it the better.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will yield the gentleman five additional minutes. I understand the gentleman's statement is that these reclamation products are in direct competition with the rain-belt farmer and the other farmers throughout the country?

Mr. McFADDEN. I do not know that I included rain-belt farmers particularly.

Mr. SIMMONS. With the general products of the country?

Mr. McFADDEN. I am talking in connection with contemplated action being demanded for laws to govern marketing of the surplus crops of the farmer, and I will say to the gentleman all of these reclamation projects certainly produce agricultural products which come on the market and into competition with production, which is one of the reasons that necessitate action at this time, or at least Congress is being pressed for action at this time to solve the farm-relief problem.

Mr. SIMMONS. On part of it the gentleman is in error because the agriculturists on reclamation projects of necessity become specialists in farm production. Some are fruit farmers, of which there is no surplus in the United States. The project in my State is largely devoted to the growth of sugar beets, of which sugar there is no surplus in the United States. Following, the next crop is alfalfa, which is used with the refuse from the beets. We devote it to feeding cattle especially and that type of farm activities. I think a fair check on the reclamation projects of the country will develop that a great many of the products are not in competition and can not create a surplus in the United States.

Mr. McFADDEN. I appreciate what the gentleman says.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman referred to that Idaho expansion. The largest expansion provided for in the pending Interior Department appropriation bill was in connection with the Minidoka project to furnish a supplemental water supply to the Gooding unit that is already developed. The settlers are there but are unable to prosper because of an insufficiency of a certain water supply. In such cases as that the gentleman does not ask that these settlers of Idaho should stay there and remain in deplorable financial condition just so that the farmers of Michigan and Pennsylvania shall prosper? Idaho is as much a part of the United States as Michigan and Pennsylvania.

Mr. McFADDEN. Oh, no. I only hold that Congress, when it deals with the general question of farm relief, should take reclamation into consideration as one of the factors involved.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I thoroughly agree with what you say about the looseness in our uncoordinated policy. The Department of Agriculture advocates one thing and the Department of the Interior another. Should not these projects, so far as the production of agricultural products go, be O. K'd by the Agricultural Department before we proceed with them?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes; I think so.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. At present we have no coordination in the matter. As it is now the farmers' organizations themselves have recently gone on record in affirming the position of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes. There is one organization that I have specifically in mind. The National Grange are upon record in support of my suggestion.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] enumerated several projects that he said would not be in conflict with the policy of preventing a surplus, as producing products in which there is no surplus. The Boulder Dam proposition was one where we were going to irrigate an enormous amount of land there to produce cotton. That, of course, would be in live competition with one of our basic crops.

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes. And the lands now made available for irrigation in Mexico will affect the growers of cotton in South Carolina, and if these cotton lands get into full production not only South Carolina will be affected but the whole South, because under existing conditions in Mexico cotton could be produced much cheaper than in the South, because of irrigation and cheap Mexican, Chinese, and Japanese labor.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. The gentleman from Nebraska refers to fruits as not having a surplus. But we do have at times a surplus of fruits.

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SPROUL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have been very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] upon the importance of a threatened appropriation for the enforcement of the prohibitory laws of our country. I agree with the idea that \$24,000,000 or \$25,000,000 would be wholly inadequate to prevent the coming into this country of large quantities of intoxicating beverages if nothing further was done. His logic is quite good and quite clear and quite convincing to those who view the proposition from his viewpoint. But, ladies and gentlemen, the real prohibitionists of this country are not looking at the question through the glasses of the wet people. Those who have been students of governmental prohibition for approximately half a century know that not only he but others who look at the question as he does are looking at the question of enforcement from the wrong viewpoint.

The real prohibitionists of this country propose to destroy the market of the importer. The market of the importers, the gentlemen whom he would keep out if he were enforcing the law, is the inducement for bringing the liquor across the northern boundary line of this country. Whenever our laws are so constructed fundamentally that the consumers of liquor and the bootleggers, the importers' agencies, are put out of business, the question of importing and the cost of preventing it will have been solved.

So long, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, as our prohibitory laws tolerate the operation of distilleries in the private homes of our citizens, the importing question is not a very important one to the bootlegger and the consumer.

The only difference, perhaps, is in the quality of the goods bartered and consumed. By amending our laws which we have had for 10 years so that distilleries may not be operated in every home, and so that penalties and punishments may be imposed upon the violators of the law that will be really deterring; when we have amended our laws so that we can have inquisitions conducted whereby we can locate the violators of the law; whenever we provide additional courts in which the offenders against the law may be promptly tried—all of which will not require much money compared with the amount our friend from New York mentioned; and whenever we provide a court remedy which will be an effective substitute for the jury trial, as we can do if we only would, we will have destroyed the great inducement of our importers to bring the liquor within from without. These laws to which I have just referred are now being prepared for the consideration of both branches of this great Congress.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman from Kansas is a sincere advocate of prohibition. He also practices what he preaches. Now, can the gentleman give us any information as to what remedy we could apply which will prevent the foreign embassies and legations from transporting 800 quarts of liquor over the public highways and through the streets of the Nation's Capital? Does the gentleman think that it is fair that foreign embassies and legations be permitted to transport 800 quarts of liquor in a truck, as the newspapers of last evening stated, and at the same time prevent a workingman from having a glass of 2.75 per cent beer?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I agree with the gentleman that a law can be enacted that will prohibit the maintenance and use of liquors at embassies.

Mr. SCHAFER. And the gentleman thinks it should be enacted?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Yes; I think that laws should be enacted prohibiting the keeping and use of liquors of any kind at embassies.

Mr. SCHAFER. I am glad to hear that from one of the most sincere and leading advocates of prohibition in public life.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. This question of law enforcement requires not only fundamentally the right kind of laws but it also requires in office the right kind of officers.

No matter how strong, ladies and gentlemen, the law might be made by Congress, unless the executive officers of the country and the judicial officers of the country are disposed to enforce those laws, they will not be enforced, and the same thing can truthfully and correctly be said of every other part of our Constitution and every other law in our country.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. I am interested in the gentleman's statement and I am as dry as he is, but the gentleman suggested a

minute ago that there were measures pending which would enable us to deal with this by dispensing with jury trials and various other constitutional safeguards. I want to know whereabouts in this Congress that legislation is pending and what is the nature of it, because we have a Constitution which says something about that.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Well, I meant to say, if I did not, and I thought I did, that bills are now being drafted to provide for an action in equity against a person conducting a business in violation of the Constitution.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Does the gentleman advocate the padlocking of homes where they find distilleries?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Yes; and I think that should include any Member of Congress. No exception should be made.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I understood the gentleman, in response to the question propounded by my friend from Wisconsin, to say that he was in favor of 2.75 per cent beer?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. No.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Then I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. No. I agreed with him about the embassies being prohibited from keeping and using liquors in Washington; that that should be done away with.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I understood the gentleman to say that would be fair.

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. No. Only as I have stated.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Does not the gentleman think that in the case of Congressmen there ought to be two padlocks on dry-drinking Congressmen and one padlock on wet-drinking Congressmen?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. That could be just as the gentleman wishes. However, I think that if a Member of Congress sets up a distillery in his own home, in violation of the Constitution, it ought to be padlocked. I think the time may soon come, if the conditions within a certain few States and metropolitan cities, together with the attitude of those States toward the Federal Government and its laws do not change that our Chief Executive will follow the memorable example of President Andrew Jackson in challenging our attention to our duty as States with reference to the Constitution of the Federal Government.

I merely take this opportunity to call attention to our duty as a Congress, and that is to so strengthen our prohibitory laws, fundamentally and with reference to remedies for securing evidence, so that we can destroy the market of the bootlegger. We should put the bootlegger out of business, and whenever we have put the bootlegger out of business the wholesale importer will have no way of getting rid of his goods. His market will be destroyed and he will be put out of business.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. On the question of enforcement in the individual States I notice in Collier's current issue that Topeka, Kans., has become the beer center of the country instead of the city of Milwaukee. Would the gentleman suggest that we padlock Topeka; and after what the gentleman from New York said about Detroit, should we not give Detroit a life sentence under the Michigan laws?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Absolutely. I should say this with reference to Topeka and the Collier article, that if there are in Topeka violators of the law they should be punished the same as anywhere else; but in Kansas we have laws ample to enforce prohibition, both State and National, and I think we have an executive there now who will see that the laws are enforced. The appropriation requested by him is not for buying evidence; not at all. There are ample laws, but we may lack officers not disposed to enforce the law.

Mr. SCHAFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER. Is not the State of Kansas, the gentleman's home State, the State where the governor had to specifically direct the State enforcement officers to enforce the prohibition laws, particularly with respect to the violators who are members of the legislature, who he claimed had been influenced by lobbyists at banquets where intoxicating liquors were freely served?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. No. I think the gentleman is not quite right.

Mr. SCHAFER. The press reports are incorrect, then?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. I think the gentleman misunderstood them or misconstrued them. In Topeka the law is violated when the executive officers are not discharging their duty, the same as it is anywhere else. There is a manifest disposition on the part of the present executive officers of the State to enforce the law, and there is plenty of law-enforcing machinery; there are plenty of courts, and the law will be enforced.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Does the gentleman favor the Senate amendment to the deficiency bill for the \$24,000,000?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. No; I do not favor it. I think the gentleman who proposed it was without knowledge as to the need for it. What we need is legislation. We need some additional courts and we need the fundamental law changed so that the penalties would be large enough to deter would-be violators. As I said before, we need laws prohibiting the maintenance of distilleries in private dwellings.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want to ask the gentleman what is the use of having more courts unless you appropriate for more jails, because you have not room enough now in the jails and penitentiaries for the persons who are being sent there?

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. We would put the bootleggers out on the highways to work building roads.

Mr. LINTHICUM. But you have to have a place for them to stay at night.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

If there is no desire for further general debate, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For incidental and all other general necessary expenses authorized by law, \$1,700.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph about which I want to ask the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] a question has been passed. The paragraph is at the bottom of page 4.

My attention was called by a colleague to this particular paragraph which relates to the issuance of registration certificates or identification tags for motor vehicles, with respect to the possibility of that provision applying to a temporary resident of the District who is paying a license upon his motor vehicle back in his home State and yet is required by law, after being here 30 days, to procure one of these license tags or certificates and being required to pay a tax here upon the same vehicle upon which he is paying a tax in his home State. I want to say, so as to rid the gentleman of any idea that it might apply to me, that I have no automobile in the District of Columbia, but I do know that a great many Members of Congress have their automobiles here. They come here in them and they take them back home. I assume the law of their State requires they shall submit to the tax assessor of the county a sworn statement of their personal property. They come here and use their automobiles during the sessions of the Congress. The law here requires after they have been here 30 days that they must have a license. When they go down to get this license they will be met with the statement, "You can not get your license unless you pay this tax." They are then put in the attitude of having to pay a tax both in their home State and here, although they are here only temporarily and are not actual citizens of the District. It seems to me there ought to be a qualifying amendment so as to protect those who are in this particular situation. This will be the situation if the gentleman who spoke to me has construed the paragraph correctly.

Mr. SIMMONS. This language is put in the bill, if the gentleman please, with the idea of requiring that a District resident shall pay personal taxes on his automobile. At the present time there are a large number of them who come to the District Building, give a fictitious address, and get a license so they can not be followed, and then they pay no personal taxes. Other thousands of them do not report their automobiles when they report their personal taxes. It is estimated that the District is losing from \$75,000 to \$100,000 a year on personal taxes on automobiles alone, and this, in spite of the fact that the license fee in the District is only \$1.

I know of no requirement that a Member of Congress has to change his license plate from his home plate when he comes to Washington. We went into that at the hearings last year, upon the subject of reciprocity as between the District and the people who are here, as we are, on official business, and I think the gentleman will find that the statement of the traffic director is that there is no requirement that they shall take out a license here.

Mr. BYRNS. Then, as I understand, this registration certificate or identification tag does not refer to the license issued to the driver of the automobile?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; this is the automobile license for the car.

Mr. BYRNS. Of course I realize, under those circumstances, he could get his license tag from his home State.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BYRNS. And he would not then be liable for this tax.

Mr. SIMMONS. This does not affect his driver's license at all.

Mr. BYRNS. But if he gets his license tag here, he will then have to pay the tax?

Mr. SIMMONS. If he is operating here under a District license, he pays the District tax.

Mr. BYRNS. I have no objection to that; but I did think it would work an injustice if it was construed as the colleague who talked to me about it this morning thought it might be construed; but, of course, the statement of the gentleman from Nebraska relieves that situation.

Mr. SIMMONS. This refers not to the driver's license but to the automobile tag.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment in order to ask the gentleman from Nebraska a question. Is the license tax \$1 a year or is that permanent?

Mr. SIMMONS. The license tax is \$1 a year. The driver's permit, about which the gentleman from Tennessee speaks, costs \$3 and is good for three years.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Some time ago the tax was \$1 and that was permanent, was it not?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; I think they have been paying \$1 a year. They have been objecting to it, but they have been paying that.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I remember when we had to have two licenses, I got a District license and paid \$1 for it, and, as I recall, it lasted me a good long time.

Mr. SIMMONS. Possibly, prior to the gasoline tax there was a different rate.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does a man have to pay the tax on his car when he goes to get his license?

Mr. SIMMONS. What we are aiming to do is just what the State of Maryland now requires.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes; I know about that.

Mr. SIMMONS. When a man goes to get his automobile license he will take the receipt of the treasurer showing he has paid the personal tax on his car.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That is what we do in Maryland.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; and that is what we are aiming to do here.

The Clerk read as follows:

RECORDER OF DEEDS

For personal services, \$104,020: *Provided*, That no part of the appropriations contained in this act for personal services and other expenses of the office of the recorder of deeds shall be expended without the prior approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or under such regulations as the commissioners shall approve, and all expenditures from such appropriations shall be made and accounted for in the manner provided by law for the expenditure of other appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BACHMANN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph down to the end of line 24, as legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I am not disposed to quarrel with the gentleman about the point of order, but I want to explain the purpose of the legislation, and then if he feels that he should make the point of order I am willing to have the Chair rule.

The purpose of the legislation is this—the recorder of deeds is one of two officers in the District of Columbia whose salary is paid by the District of Columbia, whose entire working force is paid from the funds of the District of Columbia, the rent of his building, the equipment, and supplies paid by the District of Columbia, and he performs a purely municipal function. However, he is one of two officers of the District appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

The sole purpose of the legislation is that the auditor of the District may have an opportunity to check the proposed expenditure of the District funds before they are made, and after they are made to check them up and see if they comply with the authorization of the expenditures that Congress has made. The legislation has no other purpose, and if the gentleman wants to make the point of order I shall not resist.

Mr. BACHMANN. I insist on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am frank to say that my judgment is that the point of order is good.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Nebraska and the fact that the proviso is legislation on an appropriation bill, the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Northwest: Sixteenth Street, Kalmia Road to District of Columbia line, \$64,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, with reference to Sixteenth Street and its extension from Kalmia Road to the District line, that is where the District is building our Sixteenth Street and the paving is to meet the paving by Maryland to the District line. The appropriation is carried with the understanding that it is not to be expended until the construction on the Maryland side has reached the District line. With that statement I ask unanimous consent to return to page 15, line 11, to correct the spelling of the word "public."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC PLAYGROUNDS

For personal services, \$113,180: *Provided*, That employments hereunder, except directors who shall be employed for 12 months, shall be distributed as to duration in accordance with corresponding employments provided for in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1924.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the proviso. It may be in proper form as reported from the committee but it is rather obscure.

Mr. SIMMONS. This language has been carried in the bill for several years and has not been changed; it is a proviso to which no point of order has been made.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I did not rise to make a point of order, but I would like to know what it means when it says—

except directors who shall be employed for 12 months, shall be distributed as to duration in accordance with corresponding employment provided for in the District of Columbia appropriation act—

And so forth.

Mr. SIMMONS. The explanation I have is that these playgrounds employ directors largely during the summer months, a part on full time, and this legislation is to spread out the expenditure over 12 months to suit their own convenience in carrying out the purposes of the act. I will say that the language heretofore has caused no trouble.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For personal services in the department of school attendance and work permits in accordance with the act approved June 4, 1924 (43 Stat. 367-375), and the act approved February 5, 1925 (43 Stat. 806-808), \$36,900: *Provided*, That beginning July 1, 1931, and thereafter, section 3 of the act of the Legislative Assembly of the District of Columbia, approved June 23, 1873, entitled "An act to establish a normal school for the city of Washington" (sec. 42, ch. 57, of the Compiled Statutes in force in the District of Columbia), shall apply only to those graduates of the normal schools of the District of Columbia who shall at the time of their graduation rank within the first 25 per cent of their respective classes, arranged in order of their ratings received for their entire normal school course.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this proviso; it is clearly legislation and there must be some purpose of incorporating a provision of that sort, and I would like some information as to why this arbitrary power should be given, making it 25 per cent in the respective classes. Evidently it would deprive all others who are not in that class of the opportunity of securing a position as teacher.

Mr. SIMMONS. The purpose of that is this: For a long number of years, dating back to 1873, the District schools in the elementary grades have been supplied with teachers entirely from the two normal schools of the District. It is an ingrowing system. We are now extending the course in the normal schools from two years to three years for elementary teachers, and beginning with the date of 1931, when the classes will have reached the full 3-year course of training, we seek here to provide that 25 per cent of the highest in the class shall receive a preferential status in the District schools. The other 75 per cent of those who graduate must compete with outside teachers on a competitive basis for positions, and this is done in order to enable the school officials of the District of Columbia to secure the best teachers they can get for the salaries which we

pay. As the situation is to-day, the most mediocre teacher who graduates from the normal schools of the District secures a position in the elementary schools in preference to the best teacher that could come here from any place in the United States.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This proviso relates not only to the items carried in this bill but it undertakes to make absolutely permanent legislation with reference to this method of selecting teachers?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BANKHEAD. And gives priority to the highest 25 per cent?

Mr. SIMMONS. At the present time they all have priority.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is this a proviso authorized by existing law?

Mr. SIMMONS. No. The purpose of carrying it is to enable teachers that come, say, from the normal schools in the gentleman's State, if they can demonstrate they have an ability superior to the 75 per cent, to obtain a position here; that is, to enable the District officials to hire them. The language is the language submitted by the school officials, with one exception. The testimony of the school officials stated 25 per cent, but they submitted to us the language with a proviso that 50 per cent of the graduates should have a preference, and we put it back where the testimony of the officials placed it first.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Has the gentleman ever thought of the propriety of having legislation to this effect from the District Committee instead of putting the proposition into an appropriation bill? The gentleman admits that it is legislation.

Mr. SIMMONS. It could go to the District Committee, yes, and would, if the gentleman wants to take that position.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to reiterate a statement I made a few days ago, that if a member of the Committee of the Whole House, when an appropriation bill is under consideration, offers an amendment which is violative of the rules of the House, some member of the Committee on Appropriations or the subcommittee will rise to vigorously oppose it and will insist upon the point of order. It seems to me that in order to be consistent, when the committee itself is confronted with items that are patently out of order in an appropriation bill, under the rules of the House, they ought to carry the matter to the legislative committees and get substantive law to support their action.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the gentleman will turn to page 16 of the report of the committee he will see that we point specifically to the language to which he refers and state that it is legislation. There is no attempt made to hide anything. This is a proposition to enable the District of Columbia to get the best teachers it can get for the money that we pay.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I shall not make the point of order against the proviso, but it seems to me that this Appropriation Committee, with the great power that it has, in accord with the policy that they have of always objecting to amendments that are offered by Members from the floor of the House, wherever it is possible, ought to secure legislation to conform to the requirements of the House and not be constantly themselves violating the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of troops other than Government employees, to be disbursed under the authority and direction of the commanding general, \$9,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to line 6, page 82 of the bill, to strike out the word "bureau" and insert in lieu thereof the word "burial."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will make the change.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

For each and every purpose requisite for and incident to the work of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission as authorized by the act entitled "An act providing for a comprehensive development of the park and playground system of the National Capital," approved June 6, 1924 (43 Stat. 463-464), as amended, including not to exceed \$100 for technical books and periodicals, not to exceed \$45,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, and not to exceed \$3,500 for printing and binding, \$1,000,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than \$300,000 of this appropriation shall be available for the purchase of sites without limitation as to price based on assessed value and that the purchase price to be paid for any site out of the remainder of the appropriation shall not exceed the full value assessment of such property last made before purchase thereof plus 25 per cent of such assessed value.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMMONS: Page 87, line 3, strike out "\$45,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50,000," and in line 13, after the word "value," strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the acquisition of land outside of the District of Columbia."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 16422, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Rules for printing.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 297

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 1731, to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by those favoring and opposing the bill, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, if the House adjourns to-night without passing the appropriation bill that has been under consideration to-day it will come up for a vote on Friday morning, to-morrow being Calendar Wednesday under a special order made a few days ago.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to a bill and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1156. An act granting a pension to Lois I. Marshall;

S. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution authorizing the President to ascertain, adjust, and pay certain claims of grain elevators and grain firms to cover insurance and interest on wheat during the years 1919 and 1920, as per a certain contract authorized by the President;

S. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a Federal reserve bank building in the city of Los Angeles, Calif.; and

S. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the committee on inaugural ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President elect in March, 1929, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 24, 1929, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, January 24, 1929, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(10.30 a. m.)

Navy Department appropriation bill.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

(10 a. m. and 2 p. m.)

Tariff hearings as follows:

SCHEDULES

Agricultural products and provisions, January 24, 25, 28.

Spirits, wines, and other beverages, January 29.

Cotton manufactures, January 30, 31, February 1.

Flax, hemp, jute, and manufactures of, February 4, 5.

Wool and manufactures of, February 6.

Silk and silk goods, February 11, 12.

Papers and books, February 13, 14.

Sundries, February 15, 18, 19.

Free list, February 20, 21, 22.

Administrative and miscellaneous, February 25.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

For improvement of navigation and the control of floods of Caloosahatchie River and Lake Okeechobee and its drainage area, Florida (H. R. 14939).

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

(10 a. m.)

Continuing the powers and authority of the Federal Radio Commission under the radio act of 1927 (H. R. 15430).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

760. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to authorize the American Legion, Department of New Jersey, to erect a memorial chapel at the naval air station, Lakehurst, N. J.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

761. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the several executive departments to pay claims for damages to privately owned property and damages by collision with naval and lighthouse vessels in the sum of \$48,135.29 (H. Doc. No. 521); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

762. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1929 pertaining to the office of the Supervising Architect, \$394,000 (H. Doc. No. 522); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

763. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting draft of proposed legislation to continue available until June 30, 1930, the unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$50,000 made in the first deficiency act, fiscal year 1925, for the Federal Oil Conservation Board (H. Doc. No. 523); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

764. A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. to the Congress of the United States for the year 1928; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 1511. An act for the exchange of lands adjacent to national forests in Montana; without amendment (Rept. No. 2190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 15919. A bill to authorize the issuance of patent for lands containing copper, lead, zinc, or silver, and their associated minerals, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FISH: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. J. Res. 382. A joint resolution to send delegates and an exhibit to the Fourth World's Poultry Congress to be held in England in 1930; without amendment (Rept. No. 2192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 1577. An act to add certain lands to the Boise National Forest Idaho; with amendment (Rept. No. 2193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 14472. A bill to extend the time for construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near the city of Vicksburg, Miss.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2196). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 14479. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Maysville, Ky., and Aberdeen, Ohio; with amendment (Rept. No. 2197). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 15201. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Maysville, Ky., and Aberdeen, Ohio; with amendment (Rept. No. 2198). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 15714. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ocmulgee River at or near Fitzgerald, Ga.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2199). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WYANT: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 15851. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Allegheny River at Kittanning, in the county of Armstrong, in the State of Pennsylvania; with amendment (Rept. No. 2200). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLIGAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16026. A bill to extend the times for the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2201). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16035. A bill to extend the time for completing the construction of the bridge across Port Washington Narrows, within the city of Bremerton, State of Washington; with amendment (Rept. No. 2202). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16162. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near New Orleans; with amendment (Rept. No. 2203). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NELSON of Maine: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16270. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge across the St. John River between Fort Kent, Me., and Clairs, Province of New Brunswick, Canada," approved March 18, 1924; with amendment (Rept. No. 2204). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 16279. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at Augusta, Ky.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2205). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEERY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 4721. An act to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River at or near Great Falls, and to authorize the use of certain Government land; with amendment (Rept. No. 2206). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 14460. A bill authorizing the Iowa-Nebraska Free Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Sioux City, Iowa; with amendment (Rept. No. 2207). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 297. A resolution providing for the consideration of S. 1731, a bill to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2208). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 13692. A bill for the relief of the Coos (Kowes) Bay, Lower Umpqua (Kalawatset), and Siuslaw Tribes of Indians, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. R. 16209. A bill to enable the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway Commission, established by act of March 4, 1913, to make slight changes in the boundaries of said parkway by excluding therefrom and selling certain small areas, and including other limited areas, the net cost not to exceed the total sum already authorized for the entire project; without amendment

(Rept. No. 2210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. KNUTSON: Committee on Pensions. H. R. 16522. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, etc., and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; without amendment (Rept. No. 2189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5264. A bill for the relief of James P. Cornes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 13737. A bill for the relief of Dennis W. Scott; without amendment (Rept. No. 2195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7282. A bill for the relief of George O. Pratt; without amendment (Rept. No. 2211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 16522) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, etc., and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; committed to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 16523) authorizing J. C. Ten Brook, his successors and assigns (or his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns), to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Columbia River at or near Astoria, Oreg., to connect Roosevelt Military Highway in Oregon with Washington Ocean Beach Highway; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 16524) to extend the time for commencing and the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDRESEN: A bill (H. R. 16525) to more effectively meet the obligations of the United States under the migratory bird treaty with Great Britain by lessening the dangers threatening migratory game birds from drainage and other causes, by the acquisition of areas of land and of water to furnish in perpetuity reservations for the adequate protection of such birds, and authorizing appropriations for the establishment of such areas, their maintenance and improvement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 16526) to amend section 7 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEAVITT (by departmental request): A bill (H. R. 16527) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to purchase land for the Alabama and Coushatta Indians of Texas, subject to certain mineral and timber interests; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 16528) providing restrictions in the computation of the amount due under any claim filed by a State, or subdivision thereof, against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLAND: A bill (H. R. 16529) relating to the construction of a chapel at the Federal Industrial Institution for Women at Alderson, W. Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 16530) to authorize the President to consolidate and coordinate governmental activities affecting war veterans; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 16531) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Golconda, Ill.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DREWRY: A bill (H. R. 16532) to provide for the reimbursement of certain enlisted men and former enlisted men of the Navy for the value of personal effects lost, damaged, or

destroyed by fire at the naval training station, Hampton Roads, Va., on February 21, 1927; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WOLVERTON: A bill (H. R. 16533) to authorize the American Legion, Department of New Jersey, to erect a memorial chapel at the naval air station, Lakehurst, N. J.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN: A bill (H. R. 16534) to allow newspapers and other publications containing matter in respect of lotteries to be available in certain cases; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 48) to provide for the printing of 2,500 copies of the hearings on "Tariff readjustment of 1929"; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDRESEN: A bill (H. R. 16535) authorizing the Secretary of War to execute a satisfaction of a certain mortgage given by the Twin City Forge & Foundry Co. to the United States of America; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 16536) granting an increase of pension to Maggie E. Shearer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 16537) granting an increase of pension to Ida M. Pratt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 16538) granting a pension to Frances A. Houston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 16539) granting an increase of pension to Emma W. Mitchell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 16540) granting an increase of pension to Joshua J. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 16541) for the relief of Margaret Lemley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 16542) granting a pension to William E. Emerson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG: A bill (H. R. 16543) granting an increase of pension to Maria Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16544) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Dirrim; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 16545) granting a pension to Mary A. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16546) granting an increase of pension to Virgil O. Adams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16547) granting an increase of pension to Annie Groves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16548) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie Gasaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16549) granting an increase of pension to Olive Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 16550) granting a pension to George A. Credit; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16551) granting a pension to Grover C. Pollard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 16552) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Osborne; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 16553) to incorporate the Society of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORTON of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 16554) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Fellows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEAVEY: A bill (H. R. 16555) granting a pension to Theodore J. Hillman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 16556) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Hamlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 16557) granting a pension to Beverly Sizemore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16558) granting a pension to Mealy Glancey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STOBBS: A bill (H. R. 16559) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Allison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 16560) to correct the military record of Francis J. Moore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16561) granting an increase of pension to Ida R. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 16562) granting a pension to Leon R. Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16563) granting a pension to Elbina L. Poole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 16564) granting an increase of pension to Julie Marie Krez and minor children; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8368. Petition of Samuel D. Hodgdon, chairman St. Charles free bridge committee, Clayton, Mo., relative to the handling of the bridge at St. Charles free; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8369. By Mr. BARBOUR: Resolution adopted by the Fresno County Council of American Legion Posts, Fresno, Calif., recommending that the Director of the Census collect data relative to the present number and residence of veterans of wars of the United States during the taking of the 1930 census; to the Committee on the Census.

8370. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of New York State League of Savings and Loan Associations, approving and urging the passage of House bill 13981, to permit the United States to be made a party to actions to foreclose mortgages or other actions in respect to real estate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8371. Also, petition of the Philippine-American Chamber of Commerce, unqualifiedly opposing any restriction or limitation to the free movement of products between the United States and the Philippines in either direction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8372. By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of Chicago & North Western Railway employees, of Racine, Wis., protesting against the enactment of a law to prohibit the so-called "Pullman surcharge"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8373. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of the Chicago Wholesale Fish and Oyster Dealers' Association (Inc.), Chicago, Ill., urging favorable consideration of the Hoch-Smith resolution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8374. Also, petition of the American Maid Flour Mills, Houston, Tex.; Canadian Mill & Elevator Co., El Reno, Okla.; the Midland Flour Milling Co., Kansas City, Mo.; the Kansas Milling Co., Wichita, Kans.; the Enid Milling Co., Enid, Okla.; the National Soft Wheat Millers' Association, Nashville, Tenn.; and the Southwestern Millers' League, Kansas City, Mo., indorsing H. R. 16346, a bill to amend the tariff act of 1922; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8375. Also, petition of United Spanish War Veterans, urging support of House bill 14676; to the Committee on Pensions.

8376. Also, petition of E. F. Drew & Co. (Inc.), New York; the Ideal Food Products Co., Peoria, Ill.; and the Ed S. Vail Butterine Co., Chicago, Ill., in opposition to House bill 10958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8377. Also, petition of the National Grange, indorsing House bill 10958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8378. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of C. J. Swenson, president, and officers of Farmers' Shipping Association, Kandiyohi, Minn., urging enactment of legislation which will give the Secretary of Agriculture the same supervision over private markets which he now has over the public markets; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8379. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of G. & W. Heller Co. (Inc.), New York City, favoring the passage of House bills 9200 and 14659 and Senate bill 1976, for additional Federal judges for New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8380. By Mr. QUAYLE: Petition of New York State League of Savings and Loan Associations, of Albany, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 13981, to permit the United States to be made a party to actions to foreclose mortgages or other actions in respect to real estate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8381. Also, petition of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, favoring the passage of the LaGuardia bill (H. R. 11886), a bill to establish the office of captain of the port of New York and define his duties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8382. By Mr. VINCENT of Iowa: Petition of Philippine-American Chamber of Commerce, opposing any restriction or limitation to the free movement of products between the United States and the Philippines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.